R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 018 610 VT 002 817

REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT.

PRESIDENTS COMM. ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

PUB DATE JUN 63

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$4.00 98P.

DESCRIPTORS- *YOUTH EMPLOYMENT, *VOCATIONAL EDUCATION, *EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, *JOB TRAINING, OCCUPATIONAL COUNSELING, GUIDANCE COUNSELING, OCCUPATIONAL GUIDANCE, MOTIVATION, LABOR LAWS, URBAN SLUMS, EMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS, LABOR UNIONS, BUSINESS, OUT OF SCHOOL YOUTH, COMMUNITY RESPONSIBILITY,

THE REPORTS OF SIX SUBCOMMITTEES ARE INCLUDED--(1) PRIVATE AND PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH, (2) PREPARING IN-SCHOOL YOUTH FOR WORK, (3) ROLE OF LABOR, MANAGEMENT, AND EDUCATION IN TRAINING OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH, (4) COUNSELING, GUIDANCE, AND MOTIVATION, (5) LAWS AFFECTING EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH, AND (6) PROBLEMS OF YOUTH IN LARGE CITY SLUMS. ALTHOUGH THESE REPORTS DIFFER IN LENGTH AND IN DEGREE OF DETAIL, IN AGGREGATE THEY REFLECT A BROAD CONSENSUS THAT NEW AND STIMULATING POLICIES FOR EDUCATION AND TRAINING, GUIDANCE, EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES, AND ECONOMIC GROWTH ARE IMPERATIVE. THE REPORTS INCLUDE ALMOST 100 SPECIFIC PROPOSALS, A NUMBER OF WHICH WERE ADAPTED AND REFLECTED IN THE COMMITTEE'S OFFICIAL REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT, "THE CHALLENGE OF JOBLESS YOUTH" (VT 002 872). THE RECOMMENDATIONS WERE DESIGNED TO FOCUS PUBLIC ATTENTION AND ACTION ON IMMEDIATE AND LONG-RANGE MEASURES FOR TRAINING YOUTH AND ENHANCING THEIR OPPORTUNITIES TO OBTAIN JOBS. NAMES OF RESPECTIVE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS ARE LISTED ON THE TITLE OF EACH REPORT. (MM)

ED018610

VTE

REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES

OF THE

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

June 1963

VT 02817

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT
W. Willard Wirtz, Chairman

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Washington 25, D. C.

Reports of Subcommittees

of the

President's Committee on Youth Employment

June 1963

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

W. Willard Wirtz, *Chairman*
Secretary of Labor

Robert F. Kennedy
Attorney General of the United States

Orville L. Freeman
Secretary of Agriculture

Luther H. Hodges
Secretary of Commerce

Anthony J. Celebrezze
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

Stewart L. Udall
Secretary of the Interior

Robert C. Weaver
Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency

Dr. James B. Conant, *Vice Chairman*

Cristobal P. Aldrete
County Attorney, Del Rio, Tex.

Joseph A. Beirne
President, Communications Workers of America, AFL–CIO

Oran I. Brown
Director of Industrial Relations, Rand McNally & Company

Dr. Samuel M. Brownell
Superintendent of Public Schools, Detroit, Mich.

Eli E. Cohen
Executive Secretary, National Committee on Employment of Youth

Mark W. Cresap, Jr.
President, Westinghouse Electric Corporation

Dr. Howard Dawson
Executive Secretary Emeritus, Department of Rural Education, National Education Association

Buford Ellington*
Governor of Tennessee

James R. Fleming
President and Publisher, The Journal-Gazette, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Cornelius J. Haggerty
President, Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL–CIO

Donald J. Hardenbrook
Chairman of the Board, National Association of Manufacturers

Mrs. Thomas Herlihy, Jr.
Chairman, National Committee for Children and Youth

Mrs. Mildred M. Jeffrey
Community Relations Director, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, AFL–CIO

Mrs. Clifford N. Jenkins
President, National Congress of Parents and Teachers

Mrs. Geri Joseph, of Minneapolis, Minn.

Mrs. Mary C. Kohler, of New York, N.Y.

Henry W. Maier
Mayor of Milwaukee, Wis.

George Meany
President, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations

Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer, of Washington, D.C.

Joseph Monserrat
Director, Migration Division (New York, N.Y.), Commonwealth of Puerto Rico Department of Labor

Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr.
President, Howard University

Frank H. Neely
Chairman, Executive Committee, Rich's

James F. Oates, Jr.
President, Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States

Mrs. Eleanor F. Slater
Rhode Island House of Representatives

Richard Wagner
Chairman, Executive Committee, U.S. Chamber of Commerce

Whitney M. Young, Jr.
Executive Director, National Urban League

***Resigned December 31, 1962, on completion of his term as Governor of Tennessee.**

Staff to the Committee

Nelson M. Bortz
Herbert E. Salinger
Helen S. Corcoran
Jane Greverus Perry
Elizabeth S. Berger
John T. Kenna
Catherine A. McKenzie
Nick Maltese

REPORTS OF SUBCOMMITTEES

of the

PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT

INTRODUCTION

The President's Committee on Youth Employment submitted to President Kennedy its report "The Challenge of Jobless Youth" on April 24, 1963. This report included 15 recommendations designed to focus public attention and action on immediate and long-range measures for the training of youth and enhancing their opportunities to obtain jobs.

In developing its report, the Committee had at hand materials and reports of six subcommittees of its members which had been appointed in February 1962. Each of the subcommittees was assigned a specific subject for discussion and appropriate recommendations. They were assisted by consultants and resource staff from cooperating Federal agencies.

The reports which make up this volume represent the work of the six subcommittees. They differ in length and in degree of detail. In the aggregate, however, these materials reflect a broad consensus of thoughtful views on many significant aspects of youth employment. They include almost 100 specific proposals, a number of which were subsequently adapted and reflected in the Committee's official report to the President. As presented in this volume, however, the reports are those of the respective subcommittee members whose names are listed on the title page of each subcommittee document.

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NUMBER 1

President's Committee on Youth Employment

Members of Subcommittee No. 1

Mr. Eli E. Cohen, Chairman
Hon. Henry W. Maier
Mr. Joseph A. Beirne
Mrs. Agnes E. Meyer
Mr. Donald J. Hardenbrook

Consultants
Dr. Henry David
Miss Bryna Ball

Resource Staff
Mr. Burke (Commerce)
Mr. Carr (Budget)
Mr. Hausler (Agriculture)
Mr. Hurt (Labor-BES)
Mr. Long (Labor-LSB)
Mrs. Wickens (Labor-Secy)
Miss Plunkett (Labor-BLS)
Mr. Milius (Commerce)
Mr. Hollister (Interior)

PRIVATE AND PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPING JOB OPPORTUNITIES FOR YOUTH

Subcommittee I recommends that the President's Committee on Youth Employment affirm the following basic views:*

A substantially greater investment in human resources of the Nation -- in this instance, specifically its youth -- through expanded and improved opportunities for education and training will tend to stimulate the growth of the economy over the long run. Our task does not encompass a consideration of specific policies and programs which could encourage a higher rate of economic growth; nevertheless, we recognize the positive relationship between economic growth and a more rapid expansion of employment opportunities.

Both the public and private sectors of the nation's life are charged with responsibility in the effort to develop job opportunities for youth.

The development of job opportunities for youth will depend upon the active participation of private individuals, families, groups, and organizations, as well as government, upon the effective coordination of their efforts, and upon the more rapid expansion of employment opportunities for the working population as a whole.

The effort to develop job opportunities for youth must encompass all youth - rural and urban; white and non-white; in-school and out-of-school; high-school graduates and dropouts; middle-income and low-income; etc. -- and must be nation-wide in purpose and scope.

Equality of opportunity, regardless of race, color, or creed, will contribute to the increased employment of minority youth.

A national effort to develop job opportunities for youth is of critical and urgent importance, not only for the immediate present but for the foreseeable future. High rates of unemployment and long-term unemployment among the lower age groups in the labor force are sources of manpower waste, social dislocation, and economic deprivation. They contribute to individual personality and behavior problems. Where long-term unemployment

---

* Separate Views of Donald J. Hardenbrook follow the Subcommittee's statement.

results in delay or denial of the kinds of work experience important in acquiring labor force skills, a major obstacle bars realization of potential abilities among youth.

The development of jobs for youth must not be at the expense of other groups in the population. The problem of adequate employment opportunities is present in the case of the Negro population as a whole and of other racial and ethnic groups, of many older workers, of the physically handicapped or disabled, and of the poorly educated. Special programs, both governmental and private, are designed to help remove arbitrary and irrelevant barriers to employment faced by members of these groups or to facilitate their employment through remedial measures. A national effort to develop job opportunities for youth must neither be in fact nor appear to be competing with these and special programs directed toward expanded employment opportunities. Where possible the various programs should buttress one another. None of these groups, of course, is self-contained. The problems of developing job opportunities for the young who are handicapped by reason of membership in a minority group, poor education, or physical or emotional disability bristle with difficulties.

Youth is not a homogeneous group. It is a convenient expression which covers a whole series of separate but related persons and conditions. The Committee's concern is to explore ways to help all youth fit into a satisfactory and rewarding pattern of adult achievement.

No single policy or course of action can be relied upon to expand employment opportunities for youth. A national effort to achieve this objective must rely upon a variety of means both governmental and private, and upon a series of attacks conducted simultaneously on many fronts. This is, in fact, what is now being done, however limited, experimental, and inadequate the efforts may be. There are action programs designed to discourage dropping out of school; to provide better counseling; to do a more effective job of placement; to recruit for shortage occupations; to expand work-study programs; to enhance skills and increase employability; to provide better job information; to reduce discriminatory employment practices; to alter employer and employee attitudes; to expand apprenticeship programs; to provide interim work for youth, either paid or unpaid, as a bridge to subsequent full-time paid employment. A few State and municipal programs are also aimed specifically at youth employment. The pending Youth Employment bill provides a multi-pronged Federal program for the expansion of youth employment opportunities.

Each of these, as well as others proposed or in operation, can contribute to the central goal. No one approach can or should receive priority. Each has its own target, and plays a small or large part in a combined attack. Each can be expected to reduce, in smaller or larger degree, the dimensions of the problems of youth unemployment and increased employability.

To assist in sharpening the terms of reference of a concerted national effort to develop job opportunities for youth, the subcommittee suggests adoption of the following terms of reference:

a. The committee must distinguish between transitional, short-term problems and persisting hard-core problems. It must also differentiate between policies and programs which are aimed at short-term, intermediate, and long-term goals.

b. It must assess both new and old programs and policies concerned with youth employment, so as to identify those which show relatively small return or promise of return, and those which warrant wide application and the allocation of greater resources of money, time, and personnel. The programs and policies considered must be local, State and regional, and national.

c. It must devise ways to achieve coordination of effort, between and among public and private agencies of local, State and regional, or national scope.

To help youth who are seeking work and to develop new employment for youth, we make the following recommendations:

1. Civic, veteran, fraternal, religious and other voluntary organizations, together with management and labor, should cooperate with government to form representative and nonpartisan municipal, county, or other appropriate local committees which reflect private and public responsibilities and interests in examining the employment needs of youth, in proposing and providing improved programs of education and training for youth, and finally, in creating employment opportunities for youth.

2. State and local governments should strengthen or, where they do not exist, establish effectively staffed and financed youth commissions or committees with the primary purpose of enlarging the employment opportunities for

youth by stimulating public concern for better education, training, and placement, and the development of new job opportunities.

3. Business, labor, and professional and semi-professional societies should provide support for and participate in local and State public efforts to improve the ways of giving help to youth who are planning to seek or are actually looking for employment.

4. Employers should examine the relevance of the standards they use to screen youth applying for jobs (for example, the requirement of high-school graduation) and the validity of the assumptions they make about the relative cost, reliability, efficiency, and potentialities of young workers.

5. Appropriate local, State, and Federal agencies should assist employable youth to take greater advantage of existing job opportunities outside the local communities in which they reside.

6. Private individuals and groups and appropriate governmental departments or agencies, Federal, State, and local should strengthen the various job-promotion campaigns for permanent, part-time, and summer employment for youth.

7. Public employment offices should strengthen and expand the services they provide for helping all youth to find jobs.

8. The Secretary of Labor and the Congress should act to provide the necessary funds and personnel required to strengthen the Division of Youth Services in the Bureau of Employment Security.

9. We recommend that Advisory Committees on youth employment should be established in each local Public Employment Service Office, broadly representative of the community to help develop employment opportunities for all youth.

10. The Secretary of Labor should take the leadership to assure that public-employment-office demonstration projects concerned with youth employment, such as those now under way in Newark, New Jersey, and St. Louis, Mo.,

are initiated in a small number of other communities, rural as well as urban, and that their effectiveness and results are carefully evaluated.

11. We endorse the key objectives sought by the Community Action Programs of the Bureau of Labor Standards of the U. S. Department of Labor.

12. The President's Committee on Youth Employment endorses the basic purposes of the Youth Employment Act now before the Congress, which seeks to provide a basis for expanding the training and work-experience opportunities available to youth and new job opportunities.

13. We endorse the efforts of the Department of Agriculture to contribute to the expansion of job opportunities for youth through relevant aspects of its Rural Area Development Program.

14. We endorse programs initiated under the Area Redevelopment Act which seek to enlarge the number of jobs and provide additional training facilities and opportunities for youth.

15. The Congress should assure, in such legislation as it may adopt providing for a public works program, such as is now before it, the expansion of employment opportunities for youth.

16. Management, labor organizations, and professional and semi-professional societies, both singly and in cooperation, should provide better information concerning labor market trends, job opportunities, and education and training opportunities with respect to youth, for use by the individual, the family, the schools, the mass media, private employment agencies, and public employment offices.

17. The Department of Labor should evaluate the use and application of the Occupational Outlook materials it publishes in relation to the placement problems involving youth.

18. Management, labor, educational institutions, the foundations, and government (Federal, State, and local) should encourage, support and intensify research centering on existing and prospective job opportunities for youth,

barriers to their employment, identifying the ways of improving the performance of the placement function for youth, along the lines proposed by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and the possibilities of creating new employment opportunities for young workers.

19. We encourage establishment of pilot projects to experiment with elevating the status of various service occupations.

Private and Public Responsibility for Developing Job Opportunities for Youth

**Separate Views of Donald J. Hardenbrook,
Chairman of the Board of Directors
National Association of Manufacturers**

The principal difficulty which I find in this report stems from the apparent belief that although any worthwhile expansion of employment opportunities rests on an acceleration in the rate of economic growth, the Subcommittee did not feel that a consideration of policies which would contribute to a more rapid rate of economic growth was within its province. Such an approach, in my view, inevitably led to a deficiency in the analysis of the problem which is reflected in the Subcommittee's recommendations.

The Subcommittee's report is based on the assumption that a sufficient number of job opportunities exists in the economy and that the problem is primarily one of training and placement. In my opinion, this assumption is highly questionable. It seems to me that the problem which this Subcommittee was asked to study is the relationship between unemployment among youth and the broader problem of the supply and demand for labor in the economy. The view which I have tried to present is that the real causes of unemployment among youth, as well as in the labor force as a whole, are rooted in certain basic economic policies which the country has adopted. As a result, a lasting solution to the problem of unemployment among youth rests on changing these policies. Failure to consider these problems minimizes the value of the Subcommittee's report.

As a further general comment, it seems to me that the Subcommittee's report places undue emphasis on the role of governmental agencies. Finding employment is, and traditionally has been, an individual responsibility. The function of government is limited to providing a climate which is conducive to the growth and expansion of industry and to the development of the individual. There appears to be no justification for the centralization in government agencies of a vast program of community "helps" under the guise of contributing to a solution of this problem.

Specifically, I must take exception to the Subcommittee's endorsement of the Youth Employment Opportunities Act. The

National Association of Manufacturers has submitted testimony to both the Senate and House Committees considering this legislation to the effect that we regard it as unnecessary and inappropriate because it appears unlikely that the programs provided for will make a significant contribution to a meaningful solution of the problem of unemployment among youth.

Also, I have some strong reservations concerning the expansion of activities of the Public Employment Offices envisioned in Recommendations No. 9, 11 and 12: For example, one implementation of this suggestion would be the recent expansion of the public employment offices to the college campus as a replacement of current activities of the colleges. Many employers and college presidents are opposed to such an expansion.

I must also take exception to the endorsement of programs in the Department of Agriculture, the Area Redevelopment Act, and the proposal concerning Public Works programs contained in Recommendations 13, 14, 15. I am not prepared to agree to a broad endorsement of such programs.

In sum, then, it is my opinion that the Subcommittee has conceived of its problem much too narrowly. In so doing it has failed to perform the genuine and badly needed public service that a more adequate analysis could have provided. As a result its recommendations are weak and amount to little more than a series of statements to the effect that current programs and activities be continued and expanded. If such programs have been ineffective in the past, it is difficult to see how expansion will make them effective in the future.

PREPARING IN-SCHOOL YOUTH FOR WORK

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NUMBER 2

President's Committee on Youth Employment

Members of Subcommittee No. 2

Dr. Samuel M. Brownell, Chairman
Mrs. Clifford N. Jenkins
Dr. Howard Dawson
Dr. James B. Conant
Mr. James F. Oates

Consultant
Mr. Wesley Smith

Resource Staff
Mr. Burt (Labor-BAT)
Mr. Ketcham (Commerce)
Dr. Mace (Agriculture)
Mr. Mendenhall (Labor-LSB)
Dr. Rosenzweig (HEW-Office Education)
Dr. Swanson (HEW-Office Education)
Dr. Walsh (HEW-Office Education)

PREPARING IN-SCHOOL YOUTH FOR WORK

Today, nearly a million youth between the ages of 16 and 21 are out of school and out of work. These young people comprise 20 percent of the total of unemployed workers in the United States. Pressing closely behind them are more than two million other youth who will seek entry into an increasingly selective and competitive labor market as they leave schools each year over the decade.

The problem of unemployment and underemployment has many dimensions. Essentially, however, there are but two primary causes. One is the lack of jobs. The other is the lack of employability.

The lack of sufficient jobs to match the employment needs of the total population is a perplexing problem whose solution is complicated by the fact that its diverse and contributory causes are embedded so deeply in the economy of our country.

The lack of employability, however, is a contributory cause easily recognized and this cause, unlike many others, is susceptible to effective treatment. Very simply stated, the problem can be alleviated by appropriate education, training, and guidance.

As society seeks a solution to the enigma of unemployment and underemployment among its youth, it is only natural that its attention should focus on its schools for society has traditionally depended in large measure upon its schools for preparing its members for the full responsibilities of citizenship, including the development of competence necessary to carry on the essential jobs of society.

Over the Nation this year some 900,000 youngsters will quit school before attaining a high school diploma. Their reasons for leaving school will vary, but for the overwhelming majority the precise and sober reason is that the school no longer served their needs.

The conservation of all youth and the basic worth of every individual are the bench marks of society's concern. Youth referred to as maladjusted, near-delinquent, potential dropouts, emotionally uninterested, reluctant learners, non-conformists, non-achievers, or emotionally unstable, demand special concern

by society. Since the school is society's chief instrument in providing for the welfare of its youth, the school has a responsibility to provide suitable job preparation for these youth as well as for others.

The President's Committee on Youth Employment is certain in its belief that current problems of unemployment and the rising occupational requirements of the future compel nationwide attention upon a wide range of imaginative plans and experimental efforts in the schools to extend, intensify, and further perfect educational and training programs designed to prepare all youth for productive employment.

The Committee, furthermore, finds it imperative for the schools to exert greater effort in the demanding task of preparing for job entry that large proportion of youth whose education ceases at, or below, the high-school level.

The President's Committee on Youth Employment, therefore, with full respect for the past performance of the schools and the current problems with which they are faced, and with awareness of the relentless demands of the future, makes the following recommendations on the exacting task of preparing in-school youth for work.

1. <u>Local boards of education should accept as policy that preparation of all pupils for work to the limit of their varying potentialities is one of the obligations of the schools as they attempt to meet the educational needs of all youth</u>.

   In modern society, youth is confronted with many vital developmental tasks during the period between childhood and maturity. One of the most significant of these is choosing, preparing for, and entering upon a career. He may take a full-time job prior to completing high school, upon high-school graduation, or he may continue his preparation through collegiate and graduate studies. A youth's elementary and high-school work is an important part of his preparation for employment, regardless of his ultimate level of educational attainment.

   Because of the complexity of today's economic and social world, the choice of a career has become increasingly significant to the youth, to his family, and to society, and has, at the same time, become more and more difficult to arrive at from reliable and adequate information.

   Early decisions of immature children are easily and frequently changed as they gain knowledge of new possibilities, and develop new interests. Decisions begin

to firm up to career possibilities when they must make choices of curricula or of courses during their teens. One of the problems of the schools is to help and encourage pupils to keep open career choice as long as possible, while at the same time making career preparation sufficiently definite and meaningful to elicit full application of pupil effort because he sees that what he is doing is important to success in his career. Even when these decisions are accomplished, however, inadequate opportunities to obtain essential preparation for chosen occupations often complicate the task and frustrate the youth.

The Committee believes the schools must bear a large share of the responsibility for those students who are not employable when they leave high school because they lack the knowledge, attitudes, or skills necessary for employment. To define the schools' role exclusively in terms of developing such basic skills as reading, writing good English, speaking well, and handling elementary mathematics, is, therefore, totally inadequate for certain kinds of pupils. Certainly their role also includes counseling and guidance which promotes an understanding of, and respect for, all kinds of labor; assessment of self-abilities; discovery of personal preferences; and, for a significant proportion, the attainment of the beginning skills necessary for actual entry into a job. Such an enlarged definition of the schools' role requires a <u>differentiated</u> educational process, with a curricular balance within each school that reflects conscious attention to the varying individual needs and potentialities of the youth it serves, as well as to those needs and potentialities common to all youth.

2. <u>The school curriculum should be modified in accordance with the educational needs, the attainment capacity, the occupational aspirations of youth, and the special circumstances of each community</u>.

   Added to the need for a balance in curricular offerings that reflects the variety of goals and capacities of youth is a need for revamping of subject matter combinations and content. There is need for original, novel and unique approaches to the development of courses fitted to the real needs of youth. The expanding attention upon Work Experience Education is but an example of realistic modification in curricular offerings and arrangements.

Furthermore, limitations placed within the Federal Acts for Vocational Education have developed a limited and unrealistic composition of occupational categories as constituting "vocational education." There is immediate need to broaden the meaning generally associated with vocational education. Unrealistic restraints, whether statutory or interpretive, in the areas of time requirements, occupational categories, matching factors, age patterns, grade levels, or school organization, should no longer be permitted to impede the extension and expansion of vocational education opportunities for youth while still in school.

3. Representative local advisory committees should be created and used to serve the schools as increased attention is paid to preparing in-school youth for taking jobs immediately on leaving school.

Advisory groups of lay citizens have long served the schools in matters involving physical facilities, bond elections, report cards, and district consolidations, to name a few. In specific areas of vocational education, representative advisory committees have assisted in course content prescription, teacher recruitment, student selection, and job placement. In many instances, advisory groups have identified themselves with other curricular offerings.

As the schools attempt to seek direct and efficient communication with employers, one tested avenue is through the use of representative advisory committees composed of lay citizens. The use of such groups to react to and propose suggestions for improvement and extension of work orientation and career preparation at all grade levels is worthy of emphasis. Involvement of labor, management, and employment service representatives in such advisory activities becomes essential if educational programs are to reflect accurately occupational preparation requirements.

4. Existing school practices over the Nation that have contributed to improved programs of preparing in-school youth for immediate employment should be identified and information about such tested practices should be widely disseminated.

Education progress is made through a series of breakthroughs, and through advances of individual schools and school districts. It does not come about through

measured, equal, or simultaneous advance across the Nation. It seems appropriate, therefore, that an appropriate agency within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare should survey the promising practices involved in school-connected occupational preparation efforts, describe and identify them, and distribute such findings throughout the Nation, with particular reference to helping different types of communities to find the best ways to meet their varying circumstances and needs.

5. Research is needed to identify and specify the extent of unemployability that is due to lack of work skills and essential related knowledge.

There is a dearth of factual evidence regarding unemployability of youth. With the assumption that lack of job preparation is but one factor in youth unemployability, it seems both appropriate and essential that research be conducted to determine the exact dimensions of this facet of unemployment.

In addition, with rapid changes taking place in our industrial and occupational structures, research is needed that will relate expected changes to educational and guidance programs for the future. Cross-cultural studies of the approaches used by other countries are important in this research.

6. The schools should assume increased responsibility for the follow-up of the student who stops his formal education on leaving school. Such follow-up would bridge the present gap which exists between school and entrance into employment without attendance at a post-high school educational institution.

It has been a traditionally and uniformly accepted responsibility that the school continues its interest in students as they transfer from grade level to grade level up the educational ladder.

It is therefore recommended that programs be instituted generally by schools to provide systematic liaison and follow-up services until pupils are successfully employed or established in post-high school education. Some programs of this kind have been developed and these should be evaluated for adaptation to the particular conditions of each school.

7. <u>The use of total community facilities and resources should be involved at an increasing rate in the preparation of in-school youth who are to enter immediate employment upon leaving school</u>.

The school should not and cannot assume the total responsibility for the effectual preparation of youth for work. Every community abounds in resources, both personnel and physical, that provide supportive means for the extension and improvement of occupational information, vocational guidance, and job preparation. These resources, if fully developed and utilized, and if properly coordinated with the schools, can make a significant contribution to the preparation of in-school youth for work.

8. <u>Major increases in financial support for schools are essential by localities; States and by Federal government, if pupils are to be prepared for taking jobs on leaving school</u>.

Lack of the necessary financial support to provide enough well-prepared teachers and counselors, as well as buildings and up-to-date equipment is a fundamental handicap which prevents schools from preparing adequately for employment those pupils who wish to take a job immediately on graduation from high school or when they drop out from the lower grades. It is of little point to exhort schools to extend their programs by adding staff and programs for dropouts and out-of-work high school graduates when they are inadequately housed and insufficiently staffed to provide a complete education for the pupils they currently enroll.

Many school systems, and especially those in the largest cities, have made careful studies of what is needed to improve and extend work preparation for youth in their cities. They have pointed out to their communities and State legislatures the inadequacies of their buildings, equipment, and their staff needs. The communities and the states have not provided the necessary funds and the problem of improving the school program is not keeping pace with the increasing demands.

If these school systems were provided substantially increased funds with the sole requirement that at the close of each fiscal year they should file a report showing that the added funds had been used to support extended and improved preparation of pupils for the world of work,

it is our judgment that they would use the money wisely, and would show a high degree of creativity. They are in the best position to determine where are the greatest needs for strengthening and extending their programs. Such provisions would reduce to a minimum the costs going for administration of the program and, in the last analysis, the talent for developing and operating extended and improved programs of vocational preparation must be drawn from these local sources. We think that the risks involved in such broad and little restricted grants are less than in the highly restricted and inadequate grants characterized by the present vocational education program.

We point to the record of the Land Grant Colleges as illustrative of the wise use of continuing grants with minimum restrictions and federal administrative costs, as compared to the use of vocational education funds with their many restrictions and comparatively high administrative costs.

While recognizing that the financial plight of large city schools is the consequence of inadequate state systems of taxation and distribution of funds for education, we think it is imperative, as an emergency measure, for the Congress to appropriate without delay, through an amendment to the George-Barden Act, a continuing grant program to encourage cities with large numbers of unemployed, out-of-school youth to extend and improve their program of preparing pupils for the world of work. We have in mind that the initial grant might be based on a minimum population or school census figure, such as a population of 100,000 or more in the last school census, and be calculated by use of a dollar per student allocation which should equal no less than $10 per pupil in full-time membership the previous year. For subsequent grants a report would be filed with the Commissioner of Education, certified by the superintendent of schools and president of the Board of Education, showing that the funds had been expended for the maintenance, extension, and improvement of education in preparation for the world of work.

This recommendation does not assume that these funds and this program would be adequate in amount and scope to solve the problems considered by this Committee. We believe, however, that it would provide the quickest, most productive step toward improvements in an area in which the need for immediate action is most imperative.

ROLE OF LABOR, MANAGEMENT, AND EDUCATION IN TRAINING OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NUMBER 3

President's Committee on Youth Employment

Members of Subcommittee No. 3

Mrs. Mary C. Kohler, Chairman
Mr. Howard Kaltenborn (for Mr. Cresap)
Mrs. Mildred M. Jeffrey
Mr. Oran I. Brown
Mr. Whitney M. Young, Jr.
Mr. Cornelius J. Haggerty
Mr. John Connors (for Mr. Meany)

Consultant
Dr. F. F. Foltman

Resource Staff
Dr. Arnold (HEW-Office Education)
Mr. Beaubien (Labor-BAT)
Mr. Beck (Agriculture)
Mr. Burke (Commerce)
Mr. McCauley (Labor-BES)
Lt. Col. Walton (Selective Service)

ROLE OF LABOR, MANAGEMENT, AND EDUCATION IN TRAINING OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH

Out-of-school youth (defined as those between the ages of 16 and 21) who are unemployed, underemployed or employed in occupations that are undergoing rapid obsolescence need the very best training opportunities that the nation can offer, yet the training of out-of-school unemployed youth is one of the greatest of our unmet needs.

The problem of unemployment among youth has reached crisis proportions -- 18% of the youth who graduated High School in June 1961 and 27% of the 16 to 24 year olds who quit elementary or high school between January and October 1961 were unemployed in October 1961. But these averages for unemployment do not fully reveal the depressing fact that today in some areas of our urban communities, such as Cleveland, Ohio, studies show an average of two out of three (63%) or in some neighborhoods even as high as four out of five (80%) of the young people 16 to 21 are out of school and out of work. They are usually untrained and completely unsuitable for employment in our rapidly changing technology. The 1960's will bring 26 million more youth into adulthood -- an increase of 40% over the number in the 50's.

While unemployment among youth increases, jobs go begging -- jobs requiring skills for which our youth are not qualified. The future is clear -- we need more skilled craftsmen, technicians, but relatively fewer unskilled workers. A number of studies have documented the fact that out-of-school unemployed youth are interested in education and training providing that such education or training bears some reasonable relationship to jobs and careers. Thus, training becomes a key for meeting current and future labor force needs.

Another important consideration in our out-of-school youth problem relates to the qualifications and capabilities they now possess. Only two out of three of those who enter high school are graduated; less than 50 percent go on to college. The majority of early school leavers are school failures, yet they are generally of normal intelligence and studies show that 17 percent are of superior mental ability.

How qualified are these youths? Our Selective Service System gives us one indication of what we have. During the period October 1948 -February 1962, 3,439,489 draftees were rejected by the Armed Forces at the pre-induction examination -- 46 percent

for medical reasons, 44 percent because they failed to meet the "mental requirements," and 10 percent for "administrative disqualifications." If we rely on the Armed Forces Qualification Test data we find that 38 percent of those tested rated between zero and 10 percent out of a possible 100. This is equivalent to a fourth-grade education. Since 6½ percent of these are high-school graduates, one can question the adequacy of the education they have received.

In considering a program of training for out-of-school youth, we need constantly to remember: 1) that although we have severe unemployment among youth we also have jobs requiring skills that are unfilled; 2) that on a long-term basis an expanded economy will solve many of the problems of unemployment, including our youth problems. In the meanwhile, however, there is an emergency and we must use emergency methods for reaching these unemployed youth.

There are those who specify that we need a tremendous upsurge in economic growth to adequately resolve employment needs of out-of-school youth. With this we cannot argue. However, we cannot wait for this to meet the problem of those already out of school and unemployed. Therefore, we propose that experiments be conducted, new programs be devised, and old programs be changed where necessary while we continue to hope and work for a more total solution. We feel that solutions can be found if all important segments in our society play their proper role in this situation. Labor, management, private agencies, government--all have an important function to perform in resolving our dilemma.

3) The key to meeting the problems of out-of-school unemployed youth is training which will help each one realize his optimum potential. Certainly all youth need to start with a solid foundation of basic education, but they need to understand (as do all of us) that education and training in today's world must continue throughout a lifetime. This requires constant and continuous education and training which philosophy has to be accepted by each and every one of us.

We assume that all youth no matter what their capabilities, can profit from education and training. It is not enough to train the talented. We must be equally concerned with all youth no matter what their real or presumed deficiencies. As a committee concerned with out-of-school youth, we feel that more specific attention must be paid to persons who do not or cannot go to college.

Facts concerning our complicated occupational hierarchy need to be more widely disseminated. In addition to facts, we believe that much can be done to dramatize the importance of significant and useful occupations for which training is necessary,

but not necessarily training at the college level. The prestige attached to a given occupation is largely determined by cultural factors which we can try to control.

4) Finally, we feel that we should concentrate our efforts at this time on those with the greatest need. Accordingly, we are recommending legislative changes and experimental programs which are designed to help unemployed youth with the least training.

Recommendations for Public Vocational Education

Because our national vocational educational policy is currently being revieved by a President's Committee on Vocational Education, we are making suggestions to that group to better meet the training needs of out-of-school youth. Our recommendations affect legislation as well as the administration of vocational education. We feel vocational educational programs can do much more for out-of-school youth -- much more than is presently being done.

We strongly urge the Secretary of Labor to convey our proposals to the President's Committee on Vocational Education and to take whatever other action he may deem appropriate to implement our proposals. As we continue our investigations, we will have additional recommendations to make with respect to public vocational education.

Vocational Education Legislation

1. The fifty-fifty requirement of half-time to be spent in "practical work" and half-time to be spent in "related classwork" should be eliminated.

   To place vocational educators in this straitjacket in order for their school districts to receive a Federal reimbursement is undesirable. It particularly handicaps the programs for the less capable students.

   With more flexible arrangements, it will be possible to provide realistic training for many occupations that are usually not taught in vocational schools' curricula. Eliminating the rigid 50-50 requirements will permit educators to adapt the educational experience to individual human differences and to varying training needs.

2. <u>The legislation should be revised so as to support (reimburse) an adequate training to include any occupations for which youth may qualify</u>.

At the present time, office occupations (commercial education), for instance, are not reimbursable under the Vocational Education Acts. Office work, service and other occupations should be supported on the same basis as "trade and industry," "fishery" or "agricultural", and "home economics."

In this same vein, we are also concerned that existing arrangements for reimbursement of "vocational agriculture" are, at once, too limiting and inequitable. More than 30 percent of federal vocational education funds go for vocational agriculture but the training must be for work on the farm or related to the farm. Yet agricultural employment on the farm diminishes year after year. At the same time, vocational educators are denied reimbursement for educating persons for agriculturally-related occupations such as creamery or butchery workers, because they are not "related to the farm."

3. <u>The laws should be amended to provide out-of-school youth whether employed or unemployed an opportunity to learn completely new and different occupations</u>.

At the present time, with few exceptions a young person who has left school must be employed in a trade in order to secure free education that is reimbursable, in that trade. A stock clerk who wants to be a craftsman cannot get such free training. There is an exception where there is a demonstrated shortage in the occupation.

If vocational education programs are to make their optimum contribution to training youth, it is necessary to develop new and more flexible arrangements for training all youth.

4. <u>The Vocational Education Acts should be amended to permit the States and individual administrators more latitude in designing programs to meet known needs</u>.

States have had 40 years of experience with vocational education. There is no reason any longer to allocate funds for specific purposes, nor to prescribe by law all details of training programs. We must, instead,

assume that we have honest and competent state officials who will create, administer, and control effective educational programs to fit the particular needs of their students.

To the extent that we remove these restricting provisions, we will permit our educators to develop programs that are realistically geared to needs rather than to sentiments or pressures of 40 years ago.

5. <u>The establishment of Area Skill Centers should be encouraged. They should train for any occupation for which youth may be qualified whether short or long-term training, low or high skill</u>.

We urge that these area skill centers be encouraged as a means of training all youth under a situation of great respect for vocational training. At the present time a stigma often attaches to vocational school training. Further, the <u>area</u> vocational training opportunity would make training more readily available to rural school districts which cannot maintain adequate vocational training facilities. Too often rural youth arrive in the cities untrained. To better accommodate more young people these Skill Centers should have a flexible schedule such as the Emily Griffin Opportunity School of Denver, Colorado, where a student may enroll any time during the year, and attend school day or night as long as necessary and proceed at his own pace until he has mastered a skill.

<u>Vocational Education Administration</u>

From an administrative point of view, a number of practices and arrangements should be abandoned or changed. We recommend the following:

1. <u>Vocational schools should conduct intensive programs of vocational testing, guidance, and placement</u>.

We are concerned that vocational guidance in our vocational schools is not as effective as it could be. To avoid wasted skills, wasted talents, we recommend sound vocational guidance programs and continuous objective evaluations of the success or failure of vocational school programs.

2. Vocational schools should realistically simulate or provide real-work situations.

Obsolete equipment used to train persons for obsolete occupations is poor economy. Our schools should provide youth with educational experiences that approximate real-work situations. This may require additional financial support, but it is well worth the cost. It might result in holding more students.

3. Work-experience programs should be developed for more occupations and for in-school and out-of-school young people at an age younger than 16 years.

Child-labor laws tend to curtail the extent of and the usefulness of school work experience programs by limiting the work to 16 years or older. Every effort should be made to change the Child-Labor regulations to except work experience programs when they are part of organized school curricula.

4. Vocational schools should conduct programs after regular hours, Saturdays and during summer periods in order to accelerate training and provide training facilities for out-of-school youth.

We feel that facilities are partially wasted, but even more important, we feel that youth are not (probably for psychological reasons) attracted to regular school programs. If we are to get out-of-school youth into educational programs, we must provide positive incentives to attract them into programs not usually associated with the regular schools which they reject. Our training centers incidentally, need not be located in public schools exclusively. We encourage consideration of other public and private facilities for vocational training of the out-of-school youth who seem peculiarly allergic to school buildings.

5. Labor-Management Advisory Committees should be aggressively reconstituted and used.

These committees have not been used as effectively in all cases as they might have been. They have been allowed to become paper organizations with no real duties or responsibilities.

We feel that these committees can be immensely helpful in initiating programs, determining educational needs, and, most importantly, in conducting objective evaluations and follow-up studies. All of this activity would change and strengthen our vocational programs.

6. Present administrative practice which limits training to those occupations where "employment is available in the area" should be eliminated.

   In light of the technical changes in industry and the mobility of our society, the aptitude, interest and ability of youth should be the guiding principle for the selection of courses by counselors and for the setting up of training opportunities. The present requirement of the "availability of employment" in a specific area should be eliminated.

7. Present policies for federal reimbursement for vocational education should be re-examined to make them consistent with current constitutional interpretation to the end that only those schools whose facilities are open to ALL citizens be reimbursed from vocational education funds.

Selective Service

Our peace-time compulsory military service has a direct effect on out-of-school youth. It could in some circumstances be a distinct boon, but because of several complicated factors in the current situation, it is actually a handicap to out-of-school youth. Our experience to date indicates that most of our youth are not taken into military service until their middle 20's. Youth are unsure of their situation and consequently apathetic about careers or training for careers because of the military service commitment which they face. The Army provides important training and maturation experiences. We feel that military experience might be even more significantly related to employment opportunities for youth. We are recommending, therefore, a number of changes in our national selective service policy.

1. Youth should be given the pre-induction examination at the time of his registration or as soon after 18 as possible. Current demonstration programs for the physical rehabilitation of those rejected for military

service should be applied to all and extended to include those rejected on the basis of the Armed Forces Qualifications Test (education and performance potential). HEW should be requested to cooperate in these demonstrations.

At present youth do not have adequate knowledge of their present and future military service requirements because pre-induction physical and mental examinations are deferred until the time they are called for active service usually in their early twenties. At this time, the draftee may find that he fails to qualify. Early examination would help youth plan for their futures and would give those youth who did not qualify an opportunity to overcome their deficiencies. Provision for re-examination would permit those who qualify to enter military service. Further, it would provide an incentive to employers to employ young people because their draft status would become more definite.

2. Use should be made of the provision that youth at age 17, with the consent of their parents, can volunteer for induction. This fact should be publicized in order that youth can work off their military requirements by voluntary enlistment.

By publicizing this seldom-used and little-known provision many young people who have left school would accelerate their military service and, by so doing, make a more orderly transition from school to work and training while serving could be most beneficial to these unskilled early-school-leavers. Guidance personnel in the schools should be apprised of these facts and the Army should publicize this regulation. (See Section relating to Suggested Demonstration Project for the Army.)

Implementation of Youth Provisions for the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

Approximately $100,000,000 has been authorized for fiscal 1963 to implement Title II of the Act which deals with Training and Skill Development Programs. Youth between 16 and 21 may be trained under this Act. A special arrangement in the Act, however, specifies that not more than 5 percent of training allowances can be paid to youth, and youth for purposes of training allowances is defined as over 19 but under 22 years of age.

Title II of the Act also contains a provision that special testing, counseling, and selection programs for youth 16 years of age or older can be arranged for "occupational training and further schooling."

These are very modest sums, but used wisely in careful experimental and demonstration projects, they may be useful in providing guidelines for further action. We propose the following:

1. Youth Advisory Committees should be appointed on an industry basis. These committees in our major industries (for example, food service, medical care, agriculture, retailing, metal fabrication, etc.) should include representatives from labor and management.

   We suggest that these committees advise as to current and future occupational needs; help develop special training programs, both on and off the job, for unemployed out-of-school youth; and explore new approaches to developing job opportunities for unemployed youth.

   Several programs currently in existence dramatize the effective work that is possible when an employer and a trade union cooperate in this effort. We do not feel that government alone, no matter how paternalistically inclined, can solve the complex problem of out-of-school youth. The example of Carson, Pirie and Scott in Chicago, Illinois, in developing training and employment opportunities for out-of-school youth demonstrates that there are new and useful approaches.

2. Youth Employment Advisory Committees should be appointed on a community basis.

   We suggest that there be appointed committees on a community basis composed of representatives of labor, management and the public to develop training opportunities for out-of-school youth.

   Part of the problem with youth today relates to the fact that our efforts are often uncoordinated. Youth advisory committees can review local occupational needs and training opportunities and suggest new cooperative approaches. In this connection, we feel that the work on Area Manpower, which was carried on under BES auspices, might be used as a model for developing community action and support. These area manpower studies, although they

vary considerably in their approach, have alerted communities to current or projected occupational needs. Perhaps even more important, they have highlighted current and future training requirements for youths and adults.

3. The Act should be used to demonstrate a variety of new types of training programs for out-of-school youth, some under the auspices of labor, management, and public agencies as well as the public schools. (See section of this report on suggested demonstration programs.)

We urge those responsible for implementing the youth provisions of this Act to adopt a flexible and innovative approach. Experiments should not be confined only within vocational schools, but should include on-the-job, on-and-off-the-job and other approaches.

Suggested Projects for Immediate DEMONSTRATION

The projects which follow, while focusing on unemployed, out-of-school youth, are particularly designed to serve the least capable of this group. They include the early school-leaver, the educational illiterate, that is, the youngster who has no saleable skill. While we recognize a responsibility for the training of all unemployed, out-of-school youth, these youngsters of the lowest echelon are the concern of our first recommendations, since their need is the greatest in today's labor market. At a later time our committee will submit a more comprehensive program of recommendations for training for both out-of-school unemployed and underemployed youth.

Unemployed youth are everyone's concern and everyone's responsibility. We suggest that the Secretary of Labor attempt to secure the cooperation of all facets of our society who have some responsibility for youth employment, by enlisting their support in putting on demonstrations that could show the way to new types of training for the present unemployed out-of-school youth. This means that organized labor, industry, the military services, governmental and private agencies, and the public schools would each be asked to carry the responsibility for at least one of the suggested demonstrations.

Each and every demonstration program or experimental project should have in it as part of the original plan a program for evaluation. We need more data on the effectiveness of these programs. We can begin to gauge the effectiveness of these programs only if there is a systematic, scientific research design for assessment in each and every case.

We are aware that demonstration projects or changes in legislation will be developed only as a result of aggressive leadership. To this end, we request the Secretary of Labor to assume leadership in getting the cooperation of the Office of Education, the Selective Service, and the Public Employment Service in fixing responsibility on appropriate community agencies for establishment of these demonstration programs.

1. <u>We urge labor to establish training centers in several local communities which would train young people who are out of school in skills commensurate with their abilities or in trades which would eventually lead to apprenticeship training</u>.

   In the operation of these centers labor could use their retired workers as teachers of the class, and could use the public educational facilities for the teaching of the academically-related subjects. Experiments in this regard could also be carried on through the use of television and other planned programs with the retired craftsman serving as a shop teacher in the training center.

   Manpower Retraining Bill programs should cooperate in setting up this type of facilities, if funds are not otherwise available. Plants, shop material and shop facilities of local school districts should be made available for after school or for evening use.

2. <u>We urge industry to provide, in several areas, on-the-job training for unemployed out-of-school youth and that these demonstrations include the use of the least capable young people with a concentrated effort to upgrade them on the job</u>.

   An excellent demonstration has been conducted by Carson, Pirie, and Scott of Chicago, Illinois. This firm employed 50 "dropouts." They work half-time in this retail establishment and go half-time in school. The company has provided each youth with a "big brother" supervisor. They also conducted an interesting training effort within the firm where these youth were taught something of business economics by conducting a simulated retail business. Both the employer and the public schools in this instance felt the program to be a success. As a measure of its success, they plan to continue the experiment. We feel this program is indicative of what can be done by employers who are willing to assume some additional responsibility.

3. Private and public agencies should develop training programs where young people may be trained in various fields of work connected with private and public agencies, such as work in the hospitals, work in cafeterias of public buildings, in public parks, in recreation; provided, always, that they do not displace an adult employee or remove the necessity for the letting of a private contract to do the same work.

The Youth Employment Bill would, if passed, provide the official mechanism for this type of demonstration. Nevertheless, we need not wait for this legislation to develop demonstration projects. We encourage the development of demonstration training projects under private and public agency auspices wherever and whenever possible. Youth Service Corps such as those planned for New York City and Washington, D. C. are typical of the projects envisioned.

4. Schools should provide, either after school hours or on Saturday, or during adult night school, training in the low occupation skills that are not usually provided for in vocational high schools and in real-work situations.

As an example of the innovative approach that is possible we point to the Lebonon, Tennessee, project where through the cooperation of community private agencies, the schools and other public agencies, and through the contributions of industry and labor, young people were trained in various building trades. Through the loan of property and the funds for materials and the use of retired craftsmen as instructors 32 young people constructed a house (in a year!). The proceeds from the sale of this house will be used to purchase land and materials for their next building project.

A number of cities are experimenting with new educational approaches for out-of-school youth. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Rockland County,New York, and Emily Griffin Opportunity School, Denver, Colorado, are examples of cities which do not seem to be bound by tradition. These school systems are but a few of the examples of realistic programs for out-of-school youth.

5. The Army should set up a demonstration project where they take the lower-functioning youngster, whom they now are rejecting, and build an induction and training program around his particular needs to see whether it is possible to get from him service that is legitimately of value to the Army.

We recognize, of course, that manpower requirements for military service have been constantly upgraded. And, we are aware that technological change has affected the military services in almost the same fashion as it has affected the civilian economy. We urge this demonstration because of the particularly acute need we face today for training out-of-school youth and because we believe that the Army could secure valuable service from these young people.

6. <u>An all-out program on illiteracy should be started among youth in one or two communities to see what can be done to bring these young people up to some minimum standards once they have failed in school</u>.

Illiteracy contributes to unemployment in the sense that persons with minimal educational attainments are employable only at the lowest rung of our occupational ladder. Illiterate youth pose an even greater problem in this rapidly changing era, because without an educational proficiency they will never be able to accept training in the growing technology.

For this prupose, we suggest a total approach including: a domestic peace corps of college students teaching young persons on a personal-coaching basis; courses on television; and courses and programs conducted for adults and youth in such places as the State Employment Services (to fill idle hours) in Post Offices or other public buildings where stigma will not attach to "returning to school."

7. <u>Training institutes for vocational guidance personnel should be conducted in summer of 1963 in several large urban communities where there is a density of unemployment.</u>

These institutes should give counselors on-the-job exposure to working conditions by having them employed in real work situations, and effort made to acquaint them with trends in utilization of workers, with labor force needs, training opportunities and with community resources for guidance in such agencies as the National Urban League, U.S. Employment Service, YMCA, etc.

To summarize, our proposals are designed to help some of the most unfortunate youth now. We consider there is an emergency among this group. Therefore, our proposals focus on those among our youth

who have the greatest difficulty in obtaining employment. There are many other things that must be done not only for this group, but for all of our youth -- including those who are underemployed, the under-trained with ability among the dropouts and among high school and college graduates.

We feel that pre-apprenticeship training, more flexible vocational programs, joint labor-managment training efforts, new community programs can be effective in training our school youth for employment. But new social problems may require completely new solutions. As a Subcommittee, therefore, we feel that we have only begun to explore a few of the ramifications of the school youth problems and that we have a task of considerable magnitude before us.

Role of Labor, Management, and Education in Training Out-of-School Youth

Supplemental Report

(Minutes of November 27, 1962, Meeting of Subcommittee No. 3)

Up to now, we have been concerned with disadvantaged youth--who are by any definition the most severe problem group--but during this meeting we were concerned with all youth. We agreed during our discussions that on-the-job training opportunities for all youth should be more fully developed and expanded. To this end, we agreed on the following:

1. We strongly recommend that sponsors of established apprenticeship training programs institute, where they now do not exist, pre-apprenticeship programs of up to six months in duration. Further, we recommend that pre-apprenticeship training projects be established as soon as possible in as many places as possible.

We feel that more on-the-job training opportunities should be developed for out-of-school, unemployed youth. There are already in existence, in some few instances (bricklaying, electrical trades, and plumbing trades), pre-apprenticeship training programs, where youth are trained in the fundamental aspects of a skilled occupation prior to enrollment in a formal apprenticeship program.

Pre-apprenticeship programs serve a number of mutually compatible interests. They serve as an effective and practical screening and selecting device while helping at the same time to make employment of apprentices less of a liability to employers. For the union, a pre-apprenticeship program helps to guarantee a steady input of qualified craftsmen into their ranks.

These pre-apprenticeship programs would be conducted normally in off-the-job facilities for a period lasting between 1 and 6 months; where the training purpose is to provide youth with minimum knowledge of tools and skills necessary to be productive from their first day of employment in a regular apprenticeship program.

Youth, employer, and union interests will be better served if successful graduates of pre-apprenticeship training programs would be guaranteed admittance to established apprenticeship training programs and full credit should be given for time spent in pre-apprenticeship training, so that the formal apprenticeship training term would be reduced by the amount of time spent in the pre-apprenticeship training programs.

These programs would be conducted off the job in some suitable training center for a relatively short period of time to six months. Provision must be made in each instance for suitable training allowances, although in most cases it will not be necessary to pay youth while they are in this first training status. The primary costs for these programs would be borne as now by industry and by labor and government. Funds for buildings, space, equipment, and supplies should, however, be made available from existing federal programs like the Manpower Development and Training Act, the current vocational educational program, and the Veteran's program.

2. We recommend that the Secretary of Labor see that there is a review and study of our national apprenticeship training program in the light of changing technology, labor mobility, changing occupational requirements, and developments in education, with a view to increasing both the quantity and quality of apprenticeship training programs.

   We feel that this study should explore the possibilities of expanding apprenticeship training in currently apprenticeable occupations, as well as exploring the apprenticeability of new occupations.

3. We recommend that the Manpower Development and Training Act be amended so as to provide training opportunities for unemployed youth, 16 to 19 years of age, who have been out of school for nine (9) months or longer. Further, we recommend that the limitation on the expenditure of funds for training allowances from the MDTA for youth (19 - 21 years of age), which is now set in the law at 5%, be removed.

COUNSELING, GUIDANCE, AND MOTIVATION

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NUMBER 4

President's Committee on Youth Employment

Members of Subcommittee No. 4

Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., Chairman
Mrs. Eleanor F. Slater
Mrs. Geri Joseph
Mr. Joseph Monserrat
Mr. Frank H. Neely

Consultant
Miss Mary Corre

Resource Staff
Mr. Beasley (Agriculture)
Mr. Fantaci (Labor-BES)
Mrs. Taylor (Labor-BLS)
Dr. Wellman (HEW-Office Education)

GUIDANCE, COUNSELING AND MOTIVATION

There is every expectation that the emphasis in the continuing cold war will shift from the military to the economic and cultural fields, with scientific advances playing an important role. The need will be for greater internal economic strength, a need accentuated by the growing emphasis on providing aid to underdeveloped nations. These trends underscore the importance of utilizing manpower to its fullest potential. However, full development and use of the nation's manpower resources require provision for effective and sufficient guidance and counseling, as well as educational and training services to give proper direction to individual effort and achievement.

Every boy and girl who fails to complete an education appropriate to his abilities and aptitudes, and each one who fails to achieve in school at a level consistent with his ability, may be a candidate for unemployment and underemployment when he becomes an adult. Each such case may represent a serious loss to our nation's manpower resources -- a loss which we can ill afford if we are to meet the urgent economic and social needs of our nation; and equally important, if we are to fulfill our far-reaching obligations to our allies and to the underdeveloped and uncommitted nations of the world.

Adequate guidance and counseling programs, with an emphasis on motivations, can play an important role in preventing the situation we face today. Many jobs remain unfilled because of lack of trained persons, while at the same time there are many unemployed who are potentially capable of filling these jobs had they been given the needed vocational counseling and guidance at an earlier time.

The motivations of boys and girls, which undergird ambitions and achievement at maximum levels of capability, derive from a complex of values. These values have their roots in the home, the church, the school, the community, and peer groups. All of these agencies and groups must become involved in any attempt to upgrade the aspirational level of those boys and girls who have adopted goals below their potential -- goals which all too often precede low productivity and socially unacceptable patterns of living.

Any attempt to improve guidance, counseling and motivation must recognize that racial discrimination in employment and promotion practices represents one of the major problems. Young people hesitate to pursue education leading to occupations where employment

opportunities are limited by management practices and labor union restrictions. Family attitudes which interpret discriminatory conditions as absolute, and labor-management policies which perpetuate these conditions, contribute directly to our failure to develop and utilize a large segment of the nation's manpower resources. Counselors with vision, knowledge, and understanding are important keys in developing the cooperative efforts necessary to the solution of these problems.

Counselors armed with reliable information concerning present vocational opportunities and future trends can do much to motivate all young people to make and carry out educational and vocational plans in line with their abilities and needs of the national economy. As a result, more youth may be expected to complete higher education and enter professional, technical, managerial, and related occupations in which there are serious shortages; many young persons who would not have otherwise done so, will complete high school and will fill the occupations that formerly would have been held by those who will now enter college. As each group capable of doing so is counseled and assisted to step up one or more rungs in the vocational ladder, the group which can enter only the least skilled jobs will decrease proportionately; manpower needs will be more adequately supplied and human resources, now wasted, will be more effectively utilized.

In concern for fully utilizing our human resources, great emphasis has recently been placed on counseling young people who are college-bound. This should be an important part of any guidance program. It should not, however, be carried out at the expense of providing counseling for youth who enter employment directly from elementary or secondary schools. Such young people also have important tasks to perform. Counselors, as well as the general public, need to have an appreciation of the interdependence and the value and dignity of all work, and to recognize the importance of helping each young person find the vocation for which he is best qualified and through which he may make his greatest contribution to society.

This Subcommittee recognizes that there is no single nor simple answer to these problems, and that the areas assigned for the consideration of the other Subcommittees have a direct bearing upon the outcomes of guidance and counseling and upon the motivations of youth. Extensive testimony from many persons who have dealt with this problem in a variety of settings has consistently pointed out that:

1. Guidance and counseling programs, continuous from the early elementary grades to the adult level, when staffed with sufficient numbers of well-qualified counselors, can: (a) improve the achievement level of boys and girls,

particularly those from disadvantaged situations; (b) reduce the school dropout rate; (c) encourage educational and career goals appropriate to individual abilities and aptitudes, and to employment opportunities and needs; and (d) reduce unemployment and other social and economic problems of youth.

2. Guidance and counseling of youth to be most effective is a cooperative effort directly involving school counselors, employment counselors, teachers, parents, and many relevant community agencies, as well as the youth themselves.

3. Recent legislative programs, which provide limited Federal financial support for guidance and counseling, have demonstrated that this is an effective means of stimulating state and local leadership and support in the expansion and qualitative improvement of guidance and counseling programs.

Within this frame of reference, Subcommittee No. 4 submits the following recommendations for the consideration of the Committee as a whole.

1. <u>Steps should be taken to increase the number of school and employment-service counselors and to improve the vocational guidance services now rendered by such counselors</u>.

We believe that funds for these purposes should be provided by Federal, State and local agencies. We endorse the principle of matching Federal funds which can do much to further action on the part of the States and local school systems to increase the number of qualified vocational counselors and to furnish necessary training and retraining for those now in service. At the present time one-half of all school counselors are concentrated in seven states.

Special preparation for <u>vocational</u> counseling should be a part of all counselor-training programs and should include supervised counseling and field work experience, adequate information concerning occupations and future manpower trends, as well as effective methods for interpreting and disseminating this information to youth through individual counseling and group procedures.

We urge that this recommendation be given immediate attention but also that it be built into a long-range program for Federal, State, and local action.

In order to implement this recommendation we specifically urge that:

a. Provisions of the National Defense Education Act should be broadened and/or other legislation enacted to provide funds to encourage local school districts to employ additional counselors.

b. The number of high-school youth served by one counselor should be reduced as rapidly as possible to not more than 300.

The present average ratio for the country of 550 pupils per secondary school counselor greatly lessens the effectiveness of the vocational counseling that can be given. Authorities recommend that no more than 300 pupils should be served by one secondary school counselor. To reach this goal more than 20,000 additional secondary school counselors are needed immediately, plus those required to serve increased enrollments and to provide for replacements.

We are aware that present school counseling may also be extended if the time of well-qualified counselors were fully utilized in areas of their special competence and not diluted with clerical and other extraneous duties.

c. Federal funds should be provided to increase the counseling staff in public-employment service to a number that will help to make possible a high quality of vocational counseling for the many young people who should be served by this agency.

The number of counselors in the employment service at the present time is inadequate and, with increased demands upon this agency called for by recent legislation (e.g., Manpower Retraining, Area Redevelopment Acts) for the counseling and selection of youth who will come under these provisions, it is imperative that the number of counselors in public-employment offices throughout the country be greatly increased.

It is recommended that there be one full-time employment service counselor for each 3000 secondary-school pupils. On the average this would mean one full-time employment-service counselor for each 500-600 graduates

and dropouts entering the labor market. While approximately 1500 employment-service counselors are serving youth, school population statistics indicate that this number is insufficient to meet today's needs and that at least 5000 such counselors will be needed by 1965.

d. Training should be provided to prepare, retrain and upgrade vocational counselors for work in public and private schools and in public-employment agencies.

e. Special preparation should be given to counselors for meeting the needs of dropouts and prospective dropouts, disadvantaged and minority groups, of rural youth on farms and those migrating to cities, of city youth in areas of high unemployment.

Research studies have shown that out-of-school youth in these groups are acutely in need of special counseling services; had they been given adequate vocational counseling while still in school, many of their present problems might have been avoided. In furthering the above, we are in accord with the recommendation of Subcommittee No. 6: "That Subcommittee No. 4, in considering the establishment of training institutes for counselors, give special consideration to the training of counselors for work in schools in the areas of concentrated unemployment."

f. Counselor-training programs should provide special preparation for vocational counseling including adequate information concerning occupations, present and future manpower needs, as well as training in methods for disseminating and interpreting such information to youth through individual counseling and group procedures.

2. Guidance programs should be extended in the following areas:

a. In elementary schools.

As a long-range program we urge that Federal, State and local financial support be given to develop guidance programs in elementary schools. Such programs should result from coordinated efforts of the total elementary school staff and should be

preventive and developmental in emphasis. Moreover, they should stimulate motivation at an age when this is especially important for the later carrying out of satisfactory educational and vocational plans. It is the earlier elementary grades that provide the best opportunities for motivation programs which will stimulate all pupils to gain the most from their school experience and to lay the foundation later for making plans for useful lives as workers and citizens.

Elementary school guidance helps young people resolve many of their problems, and therefore decreases problems that would otherwise be brought to high school counselors. This will permit secondary school counselors to spend more time in providing educational and vocational guidance.

b. In the public employment service.

Additional staff should be provided for public employment offices throughout the country so they may not only counsel youth more effectively but also be able actively to seek out jobs in which these young people may be employed.

c. In the Armed Services.

The Defense Department should join with the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, in further developing a program which may result in more effective vocational counseling for those entering and leaving the Armed Services. This should contribute to maximum utilization of manpower resources in both civilian and military occupations, with a minimum of conflict to the career development of the individual.

3. Present counseling programs should be improved by extending the cooperative practices between local schools and public-employment offices and by exchanging information and establishing cooperative services between these agencies.

We urge the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and appropriate State and local officials to examine the cooperative efforts now in existence between local schools and public-employment

offices, to the end that these programs may be increased and improved in quality. Such cooperative efforts should serve dropouts seeking jobs as well as high-school graduates.

4. The Occupational Outlook Service of the Department of Labor, in cooperation with the U. S. Office of Education should increase its efforts to discover the needs of counselors for special types of occupational information; take steps to provide such materials and encourage wider distribution and more effective use of information published by this service.

   Counselors not only need special training programs but they also constantly need special materials to keep them abreast of the current manpower situation, and changing occupational needs, as well as long-range information on vocational trends. Counselor-training programs, and occupational information furnished to counselors and pupils, should emphasize the value and importance of all work, in order to develop in counselors and pupils an appreciation of the contribution made by each worker to society -- the barber, as well as the bacteriologist; the airplane mechanic, as well as the astronaut.

5. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, through the U. S. Office of Education, should examine means of encouraging local communities, States, and Federal government to provide student aid and scholarship funds and also to provide more information about such funds now available, so that qualified youth may be motivated and enabled to complete high school or to enter and complete post high-school programs.

   We also commend this need to private philanthropic and voluntary agencies -- local, State, and National.

6. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, through the Office of Education, together with the Department of Labor, should set up a clearing house to gather and widely disseminate information on successful vocational guidance, counseling and motivation programs.

   As one way of familiarizing other communities with such practices, we recommend that arrangements be made for key persons, such as superintendents of schools, members of boards of education, etc., to visit these programs.

7. Special projects should be developed in the areas of guidance, counseling, and motivation to stimulate new and imaginative approaches toward solving the problems of unemployed youth.

Research should be an integral part of these projects to provide for their evaluation and to point ways to more effective practices and programs in these areas in the future.

We suggest that the following projects be undertaken, to be aided by public or private funds:

a. Establishment of vocational-guidance workshops in a few carefully chosen communities to give special in-service training to counselors in occupational information and to prepare counselors to meet the special counseling needs of youth in disadvantaged and minority groups, those who are prospective dropouts, rural youth coming to the city, city youth in areas of concentrated unemployment.

b. Organization of a special field staff from the Department of Labor and the U. S. Office of Education to assist and encourage State Departments of Education to develop in-service training for vocational counselors throughout each state with particular emphasis on better understanding and more effective use of occupational information.

c. Establishment of youth employment counseling centers in several communities.

It is recommended that the Department of Labor assume responsibility for setting up these centers in neighborhood locations apart from existing agencies. These neighborhood counseling centers should be integrated and financed by the Department of labor, utilizing both public and private resources of the community. They should serve to demonstrate staff resources, tools and methods essential in providing effective vocational counseling services to out-of-school youth.

d. Establishment of demonstration projects in selected elementary schools to show effective practices and to evaluate outcomes of guidance for younger pupils which emphasize motivation.

e. Establishment of additional demonstrations in the area of motivation similar to those in New York City and St. Louis schools, to show how youth, especially those from disadvantaged and minority groups, may be encouraged to develop educational and vocational plans more in line with their abilities, and ways in which community resources and parent education and cooperation may be utilized.

8. The active endorsement and cooperation of government agencies, of professional associations, and of pertinent organizations, and individuals should be solicited to implement recommendations of the President's Committee on Youth Employment.

a. State governors should be encouraged to sponsor legislation for expanding guidance and counseling services in their respective states and should, in turn, request local school boards to appropriate additional funds for this purpose.

b. The Department of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare should give immediate encouragement, and such assistance as is necessary, to state departments of education and State employment services, and through them to local schools and employment offices;

1. To provide additional funds to increase the number of vocational counselors;

2. To provide, as soon as possible in the school year 1963-64 and continuously thereafter, special training programs so that vocational counselors may be more adequately prepared.

c. Professional associations should support and actively work for these recommendations as they may relate to their special concerns.

d. The Federal government should call a conference of representatives of mass media, television and radio networks, newspapers and journals, as well as representatives of the National Advertising Council and similar groups, to enlist their cooperation in arousing the country to the urgency of problems relating to youth employment and in presenting nationwide programs which may suggest and stimulate action toward solving these problems.

LAWS AFFECTING EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NUMBER 5

President's Committee on Youth Employment

Members of Subcommittee No. 5

Mrs. Thomas Herlihy, Jr., Chairman
Mr. James R. Fleming
Mr. Richard Wagner
Mr. Cristóbal P. Aldrete

Resource Staff
Mr. Baker (Agriculture)
Mrs. Corcoran (Labor)
Mrs. Diamond (Labor-LSB)

Consultant
Mrs. Lucy Manning

LAWS AFFECTING EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH

The present youth unemployment problem exists in a context of general shortage of job opportunities for youth and adults alike. In focusing on legislation affecting youth employment, the Subcommittee did not consider broad economic legislation involved in developing additional job opportunities generally.

The Subcommittee examined Federal and State laws most directly affecting youth employment, particularly the child labor and compulsory school attendance laws and regulations thereunder to determine to what extent, if any, they might be modified in content or administration to open additional job opportunities for youngsters seeking employment without jeopardizing the laws' fundamental protective and other objectives.

Child-labor laws, which specially regulate employment of youth below the age of 16, and to a lesser extent at ages 16 and 17, were meant to be restrictive and as such do limit employment of youth. So do compulsory school-attendance laws. They complement each other, in purpose and practice, to give education and protection of health and general well-being of youth priority over employment. With few exceptions, they permit employment of youth, but within regulated limits intended as safeguards for the education and health of youth.

In weighing whether these laws apply soundly, the Subcommittee proceeded on the basis of several basic value judgments:

1. Jobs should not be sought for youth at the expense of adult workers.

2. For long-run benefits for youth under 18, primary emphasis and reliance must be put on suitable education and training. This is necessary to gain the most effective development of attitudes and skills needed to qualify youngsters best for a lifetime of employment competition in a modern economy.

3. Development of work experience and good work habits is important for youngsters. This can usually best be provided through actual employment, but there must be adequate safeguards against exploitation or inappropriate types of work, and the demands of the job must not interfere with school education.

The Subcommittee's basic conclusion is that both city and rural youth would best be benefited by emphasis on improvement in training and education, and not by relaxation of legislative standards and protections. Certain modifications in the laws may be useful, however, in helping to provide some limited additional work opportunities for youth. They include re-evaluation and updating of prohibited hazardous occupations, devising more efficient methods of issuing employment certificates, and development of combination work-and-study programs (with particular exploration of whether such programs for 14- and 15-year olds under careful school supervision would provide helpful preparation for later employability).

The Subcommittee also concluded that periodic review of administration of the laws is advisable to adapt them to changing conditions so that practices may be modified to keep pace with change in educational methods and industrial conditions.

The recommended modifications and reviews of specific features of the legislation examined by the Subcommittee cannot in themselves, however, open up substantial additional desirable job opportunities for youth. Cutbacks in statutory youth employment standards would not solve youth employment problems which are widely rooted in immaturity, lack of training, undereducation, and the decrease in jobs for unskilled workers.

Finally, the Subcommittee emphasizes the need for improvement in information programs to develop better public and employer understanding of youth employment laws. Misunderstanding of child-labor and other laws, rather than the content of the laws, may somethimes block employment. Misconceptions about the effect of employment of youth on workmen's compensation rates is one example. Another is the belief of some employers, parents, and youngsters that employment is entirely prohibited until a child is 16 or even 18. In addition, the laws often are used as an excuse by some employers unwilling to hire young people.

In summary, child-labor and related legislation does not materially affect youth employment, except in the sense that it achieves the purpose for which it was originally intended. A much more significant factor is the decrease in employment opportunities in an economy that is increasingly requiring more education, skills, and training in its workers. These are qualifications that the young worker has to only a limited degree.

The scope of Subcommittee considerations and the information available from its review are reflected in this list of subjects covered:

Effect of Employment of Minors on Insurance Rates for Workmen's Compensation

Employment Certificates

Hazardous Occupations Prohibited Under Child-Labor Laws

School-Work Programs

Minimum Wage Legislation

Lack of Understanding of Child-Labor Laws

Youth Employment and Service in the Armed Forces

Minimum Age Provisions

Effect of Nightwork Prohibitions on Employment Opportunities of Youth

Limitation on Hours of Work of In-School Youth Employed Outside School Hours

School Attendance Laws

Children of Migratory Agricultural Workers

Effect of Public Law 78 on Employment Opportunities of Youth

Effect of Employment of Minors on Insurance Rates For Workmen's Compensation

Statements are frequently made that some employers refuse to hire young workers because their rates for workmen's compensation insurance would be raised.

At the Subcommittee's request, the Bureau of Labor Standards has again investigated this matter. The National Council on Workmen's Compensation Insurance, which is the general rating authority for workmen's compensation premium rates, has advised the Bureau that the age of the employee does not change an employer's rate, although the relative hazards in the company's work and its accident experience will be taken into consideration in the rate-setting procedure in the State.

Basic workmen's compensation insurance rates are set in each State on the basis of the industrial classification into which the worker's job falls. The amount of premium an employer pays is calculated, in the first instance, by multiplying the appropriate rate times each $100 of payroll. Such programs as premium discounts and dividends of participating companies afford premium reductions for the policyholder. Rating Plans also provide reductions for good accident experience. The workmen's compensation insurance rate has three components:

1. The amount that is needed for each $100 of payroll to meet anticipated expenditures for medical and indemnity payments;

2. The amount required to reimburse the insurance carrier for its expenses. Included in the latter are such items as the cost of claim adjustments, home office expenses, safety engineering services, payroll auditing, taxes; and

3. A reasonable allowance for profit and contingency.

It is incorrect to conclude that employment of a minor will result in an increased premium charge by the insurance company.

The Secretary of Labor should bring this matter to the attention of the International Association of Accident Boards and Commissions and the International Association of Governmental Labor Officials at their next annual meetings and request their assistance in correcting this misapprehension among employers. The

appropriate State officials are urged to publicize the fact that there is no basis for the fear that if an employer hires young workers his workmen's compensation rates will go up.

Employment Certificates

The ease by which employment certificates are issued has a direct bearing on the employment of youth. In some areas employers do not consider employment certificates a problem at all. But in other areas, employers find them a real obstacle. Much of the difficulty stems from cumbersome issuance procedures, often not adapted to all sizes of communities, and not sufficiently streamlined to save time and effort on the part of both the employer and the youth. Sometimes neither the employer nor the person actually issuing the certificates has a clear understanding of the child-labor laws, including Federal requirements and interpretations.

In 25 States and the District of Columbia employment or age certificates are required for minors 16 and 17 (in two, only for 16-year olds). In 20 other States age certificates are issued as a matter of practice. This is done as a convenience to both the employer and the child. Employment certificates are required for minors under 16 years of age in practically all States. Certificates are issued usually by local school officials.

It is well known that the quality of certificate issuance varies widely, from excellent to poor. In cities and areas where the issuance may be termed excellent, getting a permit is simple and employment is facilitated. The converse is also true.

If certificates are issued incidentally as a by-product of another job and without recognition of their importance and value in protecting both employers and youth, permit issuance may suffer and be a slow and frustrating experience. If application forms are not clear, or if forms and instructions are not easily accessible to the youth, he may have to make several trips to the issuance office, often over long distances, before the certificate is finally issued to the employer. In the meantime, the job may slip away.

Employment and age certificates issued under State child-labor laws are accepted as age certificates under the Fair Labor Standards Act under a program of cooperation with the States. Although not required under the FLSA, these certificates protect the employer against unintentional violation of the act if they show that the minor is old enough for the job.

There is a great turnover in certificate-issuing personnel, and there seems to be much lack of understanding of the provisions and interpretations of the child-labor laws.

1. State agencies responsible for the supervision of employment certificate issuance should review the employment certificate system as it is operated in the various communities in the State, and insofar as consistent with the purpose of employment certificates, simplify and streamline procedures and forms, in order to facilitate issuance and save time and effort in obtaining employment certificates, thus smoothing the way to employment.

2. Steps should be taken to ensure better understanding as to the purpose and value of such certificates on the part of employers, parents, youth, school officials, and issuing personnel.

3. A program of consultation should be provided by the U. S. Department of Labor in interpreting the Federal child-labor provisions to State agencies and certificate-issuing officers and in assisting the State labor or education departments to develop and maintain a program of in-service training for employment certificate-issuing officers.

Hazardous Occupations Prohibited Under Child-Labor Laws

Under both the Fair Labor Standards Act and State child-labor laws, the employment of youth in certain hazardous occupations is prohibited. These prohibitions are based on the premise that the young worker, becasue of his immaturity and experience, is more likely to be injured than the mature adult worker.

The problem before this Subcommittee is to see whether provisions go beyond necessary protection and prevent youth from working in certain non-hazardous jobs.

Federal Provisions

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, minors under 18 are prohibited from employment in 16 occupational or industry areas declared hazardous by orders of the Secretary of Labor. These orders appear to be adequately supported, not only by thorough investigation made prior to their issuance, but by general and expert opinion, as being necessary for the minors' protection. Exemption of apprentices and vocational-education-students 16 and 17 is provided where appropriate.

The Federal regulation prohibiting the employment of 14 - and 15-year-olds outside school hours in operating power-driven machinery exempts electric typewriters and office machines. It would seem desirable to permit their employment also on certain non-hazardous electrical appliances.

State Provisions

The hazardous occupations provisions in State child-labor laws apply to minors under 18 or only to those under 16. They are for the most part statutory. Only about a fourth of the States have issued orders prohibiting employment in hazardous occupations.

There is considerable variation in the protection provided by State hazardous occupations provisions. State prohibitions are more comprehensive for minors under 16 than for minors under 18. Some laws prohibit employment in many occupations, others in only a few. Certain prohibitions are common to many laws. Included in the areas of employment most often classified as hazardous are work in mines, occupations in construction work, logging and sawmilling, operation of hoisting apparatus, operation of power-driven woodworking machines, and exposure to health hazards.

A number of States have revised their hazardous occupations provisions in recent years. Provisions, however, in some States do not fit today's needs. Some fail to cover new hazards. Some are outmoded or apply to employment not originally intended. For example, some 20 States prohibit the employment of minors under 16 (3 of these, minors 16 and 17) in operating power-driven machinery without specifying the type of machine. Literally interpreted this prohibition covers the operation of electric typewriters and other office machines, and electrical appliances such as vacuum cleaners or blenders. A few exempt the operation of non-hazardous electrical appliances and office machines. Only three of the prohibitions are limited to "dangerous" power-driven machinery.

The Subcommittee is aware that these general prohibitions are used to protect youth from some very dangerous machines such as power-driven meat-grinding and slicing machines, power-driven lawn mowers, some metal-working tools, and doubtless others. Such protection should not be lost.

Apprenticeship and Vocational Education Courses: Many of the State hazardous occupations provisions appear to prevent apprentices and students in vocational training classes from using machines needed in the course of their training. In only 13 States do the hazardous occupations provisions contain apprenticeship exemptions; in only 17 are machines used in vocational education courses exempted. These exemptions are usually general in nature, but some are limited to specific situations.

Application to youth 16 and 17 years of age: Only 16 States classify as hazardous a considerable number of occupations for minors 16 and 17. In the remaining States, little or no protection is afforded minors of these ages.

Not many jobs for minors 16 and 17 are affected by hazardous occupations provisions. Estimates made some years ago in the U.S. Department of Labor indicated that roughly only about 5 percent of all jobs are classified as hazardous and subject to the 18-year minimum age.

Application to youth under 16: The protection of youth under 16 years of age from work in hazardous occupations is naturally far more comprehensive than for the older youth. Twenty-four States prohibit children under 16 from work in a comprehensive list of hazardous occupations. Under the laws of 24 other States and the District of Columbia, only a few hazardous occupations are prohibited under 16, and under 2 laws no occupations are so classified.

State and Federal hazardous occupations provisions do not materially affect job opportunities of youth 16 and over. Since a substantial proportion of employed minors under 18 work in establishments not covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, the need for improving and updating hazardous occupations provisions in the States is clearly evident. A few job openings for young workers might result if operation of non-hazardous electrical appliances and office machines were permitted.

State labor-law administrators are responsible for administration of hazardous occupation provisions under State child-labor laws. They are urged to review the hazardous occupations provisions to determine the extent to which they apply to today's needs. Outmoded provisions should be brought up to date. New hazardous machines or occupations involving new hazards should be added.

Consideration where appropriate should be given to exempting from the general provision prohibiting operation of power-driven machinery, the operation of electric typewriters and other usual office machines and non-hazardous electrical appliances. It is not the Committee's intention to suggest the removal of any prohibition that is needed for a young worker's protection. Caution should be exercised, therefore, so that the general prohibition of operating power-driven machinery should not be removed unless it is replaced by prohibitions specifically designating any actually hazardous machines to which the present prohibition may now be applied.

A review of the State hazardous occupations provisions as they may affect participation in vocational education courses, work-study programs, or approved apprenticeship programs would also seem to be indicated, to determine if exemptions are necessary to facilitate the training of youth.

School-Work Programs

Within this decade, it is estimated that one out of three children will drop out of school before high-school graduation. The highest proportion will leave school in the 10th grade. For many children of 14 and 15, school has been an unsatisfactory and frustrating experience. These children often come from low-income groups. Their personal and family experience has given them little understanding of work, of types of jobs available, of requirements for jobs, or of a worker's responsibility to his job, his employer, and to his fellow workers. By this age their negative orientation towards society and work has begun to crystalize and is not likely to change unless specific efforts are made to give them a realization of the positive values of work and the enduring values of our society.

It has been suggested that school-work or work-experience programs may be one way to motivate and stimulate these particular 14- and 15-year-olds to make a better adjustment to school. These programs, if carried out so as to make the children see the value of school in relation to work, would make school programs more interesting. At the same time the programs would teach the student an awareness of the value of proper work attitudes, and the ability to work with others. He could be taught how to secure a job and keep it.

There is a belief on the part of some school people that school-work programs for the child who has been unsuccessful in school are more effective in producing adjustments and improved attitudes when started with a pupil 14 or 15. Age 15 is considered by one educator as the strategic age level for preventive therapy. Moreover, it would seem to provide for this group of children one last chance to arouse in them an aspiration for further education.

This Subcommittee has considered primarily the extent to which existing child-labor and compulsory school-attendance laws permit school systems to carry on school-work programs for 14- and 15-year-olds.

Types of Programs

School-work programs are not new. The U.S. Office of Education in its guide book on Work Experience Programs, publication No. 5, (1957), indicates that some forms of school-work programs have been in continuous operation for more than 40 years. Also, there are different types of work-experience programs.

These include (1) unpaid work experience, either exploratory or service; (2) vocational work experience, paid programs involving parallel occupational training; and (3) general work experience, paid miscellaneous jobs with no parallel school occupational training.

The Office of Education subdivides or classifies school-work programs in its 1957 bulletin into six types. These range from nonremunerative general experience programs to the remunerative work experience programs in high school under the Federal Vocational Education Acts. One type mentioned in the Office of Education bulletin is "Remunerative General Education Work Experience Programs" at junior high-school level. These programs would appear to be for 14-and 15-year-olds. The bulletin mentions as illustrations of the type of programs those in Baltimore, in Minneapolis (open to 15½ year olds), and in Philadelphia.

Difficulty was encountered, the bulletin indicated, in the Minneapolis program because the Federal Act sets a minimum age of 16 for employment during school hours. One of the establishments in the Baltimore program had to discontinue employing 14- and 15-year-olds because of the Federal Act. A number of programs are believed to be presently in operation which accept 14- or 15-year-olds. For instance, in 1959 school authorities reported programs in Des Moines, Santa Monica, Chicago, Lexington, Ky., Rochester, N.Y., Hagerstown, Md., and Lincoln, Nebr. In addition, Kansas City, Mo. is carrying on a program under a private foundation grant.

While there is a considerable body of material on work-experience programs, most information available appears to relate to youth 16 or over. Actually, descriptions of most reports mention grades from which students are acceptable and not age of students accepted. It is noted that many programs operate in the 11th or 12th grades. Programs operating at these grades are seldom available for minors under 16, and would ordinarily not be available to the youngsters leaving school in the 10th grade.

An unpublished staff report by the Bureau of Labor Standards based on a 1959 survey of programs in five States, indicates differences of opinions as to the value of school-work programs for youth whose needs are not met by traditional schooling. The strongest advocates of the school-work technique are the authorities in local schools with such programs. These school people believe such programs have educational value and that they help the school hold potential dropouts. Some think that something is needed for the 14- and 15-year-olds who are not getting anything out of schooling.

Authorities further removed from the functioning programs, though interested, were more reserved. The view was expressed that the kind of jobs available for this age group could not be tied into the educational process, and that these children are too undisciplined for work experiences. They also pointed out that employers in general do not want them.

School-Work Program Not the Only Answer

The transition from school to work is difficult for any boy or girl. The youth who has not had a successful school experience needs special help in learning to be a satisfactory employee. These include the slow learners, the retarded, and the nonacademic children whose needs are not met by traditional academic or by most trade-occupational programs. These children are likely to leave school at 16 or earlier. They might benefit from a school-controlled school-work program. Such a program might promote the child's total development, add purpose to his life, train him to accept direction and authority, and might even motivate him to continue his schooling.

The Subcommittee wishes to emphasize, however, that it does not think school-work programs alone are the answer for children 14 and 15 who have special needs which the standard school program does not provide. If these children were given special help and attention utilizing many resources, they might develop the motivation necessary for them to adjust to school.

To really solve the problem of dropouts, schools should begin in the lower grades to identify children who may leave school at 16 or earlier. These children should be helped to correct any deficiencies causing their retardation. If children are not academically inclined, some new in-school approach should be found to capture the child's interest. The child must have training which will give him a sense of personal worth and stimulate him to develop himself to his fullest capacity.

The schools should help all students to develop an attitude toward the value of all work. Today, students are being constantly urged to prepare themselves for jobs requiring more education and higher skill. The child who does not have the capacity for such a job may feel inferior and unworthy. He may have the same desire for a high grade job as the bright student, and may not realize his limitations. He must be taught to work within his capacity and to give his best to his job. Even with the increase in skilled and professional jobs, there will be many unskilled and semi-skilled jobs that are equally necessary and equally important to

our society. The people who are to do these must feel that the jobs are important and necessary. They must feel that society has need for all kinds of abilities.

Some Difficulties That May Be Encountered

The Subcommittee is aware of the difficulties surrounding the establishment of a school-work program for children 14 and 15. Such programs are expensive. They must be started with small numbers, more or less on an experimental basis. Responsible employers must be found who are willing to cooperate. Suitable jobs must be found. In addition, the objections of parents who want traditional education for their children must be considered.

Under present conditions, it is difficult to find jobs that children 14 and 15 can do. It is also difficult to find employers who will participate in a sustained part-time work program.

Nonremunerative school or community projects may also provide work experience for this program.

School-work programs can succeed only with community support and interest, and with imaginative planning and supervision.

Effect of Child-Labor Laws on Development of Programs for 14- and 15-Year-Olds

School-work programs generally provide for employment on school released time. These programs operate on different schedules; sometimes students work half a day or less; they go to school the rest of the school day. Sometimes the student will work all day for one or two weeks at a time, then return to school for such periods and other students take over their jobs.

It would not be possible to place students 14 and 15 with employers whose establishments are subject to the 16-year minimum age during school hours under the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Moreover, such programs could not be established in a State with a 16-year minimum age for employment during school hours, unless there is a specific exemption for such a program or unless the child is released under some interpretation of the minimum age applicable during school hours. A few State laws contain such exemptions.

In over half of the States children may go to work at 14 during school hours. Programs could be developed if jobs could be found that are suitable and that are not subject to child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

In a 1959 unpublished staff report of the Bureau of Labor Standards it is stated that there was little desire among the employers interviewed to lower the minimum age for employment to permit school-work programs for minors under 16. Moreover, the same position was taken by public officials in the most responsible positions in the labor and educational fields who were interviewed.

Such employment would also be subject to the maximum-hours regulations in the Federal Child-Labor Regulation No. 3 -- not more than three hours a day or 18 hours a week. Under this regulation students could not be placed on an alternate week basis. Such employment would also be subject to hours regulations affecting in-school youth in State child-labor laws. As a rule, these limit combined hours of school and work to 8 a day. Some of these laws regulate daily and weekly hours, limiting daily hours to 3 or 4 hours and weekly hours to 23 or 28 hours. It would seem possible to develop programs within these restrictions.

Believing that positive measures should be taken in the lower grades to correct the attitudes and deficiencies of children and school programs that lead children to drop out of school, and that special attention and help given children now 14 and 15 years of age who may drop out at 16 might provide the necessary motivation for them to stay in school, the Subcommittee recognizes that school-work programs for potential dropouts may be one means of assisting this group. Therefore, we recommend:

1. Since in over half the States children of 14 and 15 may go to work during school hours under certain circumstances, full exploration should be made through demonstration work-study programs under existing laws to determine the value of such programs for 14- and 15-year-olds who are potential dropouts.

2. The Secretary of Labor in cooperation with the Office of Education should study existing school-work programs for 14- and 15-year-olds and determine their value as a means of curtailing dropouts.

3. If it is determined that school-supervised school-work programs may benefit children 14 and 15 who do not profit from the ususal curriculum, the Secretary of Labor should

(a) explore the possibility of permitting, under the Fair Labor Standards Act, employment of such children for limited periods during school hours in school-supervised school-work programs, under conditions which would not interfere with their schooling or their health and well-being; (b) re-evaluation of the need for such employment and the effectiveness of the program should be made from time to time; (c) the criteria and standards for such school-work programs should be worked out by the Secretary of Labor, the Office of Education, and the Secretary of Commerce.

4. The Secretary of Labor should consider the possibility of permitting employment in additional occupations that do not involve manufacturing or mining and that are non-hazardous for minors 14 and 15 in school-supervised school-work programs.

Minimum Wage Legislation

Are employment opportunities of minor workers affected adversely by the laws requiring the payment of a minimum wage or by wage board orders issued under minimum wage legislation? Or do these laws merely provide needed protection for the young, inexperienced worker and insure that he will not be the victim of undesirably low wages?

The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act applies minimum wage standards to employees of any age engaged in interstate or foreign commerce or in the production of goods for such commerce as well as to employees of certain large enterprises engaged in such commerce. Many State laws require the payment of minimum wages to covered workers. Minimum wage laws as originally passed were primarily for the protection of women and minors. The Federal act and 15 of the State laws now apply to men as well. The Federal act and 18 of the State laws set a statutory minimum wage. In the other States having minimum wage laws, rates are set only by wage orders. There is a tendency for the State laws and orders to concentrate on employments not covered by the Federal act.

As to minimum wages required, the present Federal rate is $1.15 an hour, except that the rate is $1.00 for workers included under the act in September 1961 -- those in retail and service establishments and certain other enterprises. Eight of the State laws setting a statutory minimum wage set a rate of $1.00 an hour for most covered workers; four other States set a higher rate, $1.15 in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Washington, and 50 cents higher than the Federal minimum in Alaska. Under other State laws the rate set is lower than $1.00.

In three of the States in which minimum wages are set only by wage orders, a rate of $1.00 applied as of January 1, 1961 to most or all orders. One dollar has been set under one or more orders in 4 other jurisdictions. Rates in other orders issued under wage board laws tended to range between 70 and 90 cents an hour; a number of orders set lower rates.

Status of Minors Under the Acts

State legislation: Wages of young persons under minimum wage laws are affected by various kinds of special provisions -- those affecting minor workers, those authorizing lower rates for learners or students, and those specifically exempting occupations which customarily use young workers. Of the 29 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, which have minimum wage laws in op-

eration, all except five have special provisions for minors or students either in the law or in one or more minimum wage orders. These permit the payment of wages lower than those required for the covered adults. The five jurisdictions which do not have such special provisions do permit lower rates for learners.

Nine of the 31 State laws exempt minors or students. Three of these 9 laws exempt minors under 18 (one completely; one, those employed part-time, not more than 30 hours a week; and one from the statutory minimum wage law but not from the wage order law). One State law exempts all minors under 16. The other five exclude students, three of these excluding students both while attending school and during vacation.

The remaining 20 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have to some extent adopted provisions permitting lower rates to be paid to minors, students or learners, either in all types of work or for selected occupations and industries, usually under their minimum wage orders.

In addition to these general exceptions, some States also exempt specified occupations for which minors are customarily hired, such as work as newsboys and as golf caddies, and work in agriculture and domestic service.

Federal legislation: The Fair Labor Standards Act, unlike some State laws, does not provide for payment of lower rates to minors based on age alone. Provisions permitting lower rates to be paid to student learners, apprentices, messengers, handicapped workers and full-time students outside school hours under certain conditions do affect young workers since the categories of employees covered embrace a disproportionate number of young inexperienced workers.

Lower rates may be paid to learners, student learners, apprentices, messengers, handicapped workers, and full-time students outside school hours under certain conditions, provided that special certificates are obtained from the Administrator of the act.

Separate regulations have just been issued to govern the employment of full-time students who are working part-time outside school hours in retail and service establishments.

In discussing the problem in the light of existing legislation, it was recognized that the laws, both State and Federal, often fail to apply to some of the occupations in which young workers

are generally employed; that some of the State laws actually exempted minors under 18 or under 16; that other States excluded students; while in still other States rates lower than those applicable to the covered adult are fixed for minors, students, or learners. Under the Federal act, while lower rates are permitted for learners and certain students, no lower wage rates for young people, based solely on age, are allowed.

The Subcommittee agreed that young workers doing the same volume and quality of work as adults should get the same pay.

The view was expressed on the one hand that minimum wage laws lead to disemployment of workers; that lower level of rates would stimulate employment of the young workers; and that the results of the same minimum wage rate for the young as for the adult worker often drives the young worker into less desirable employment; that the effect on opportunities for employment should be studied by a non-governmental agency.

On the other hand, the view was expressed that young workers stand in special need of minimum wage protection; that this needed protection does not hinder their employment opportunities; that there is no information available to support a recommendation for revision of the present pattern of legislation as a means of stimulating employment opportunities; that it is not desirable to promote employment for youth merely by cutting back minimum wage legislation. Moreover, it was brought out that the effects of minimum wage legislation go far beyond the individual covered worker and that a lower rate or no wage floor for minors may pull down wages or reduce employment for adults. Finally, it was emphasized that minimum wage laws are an important factor in maintaining the stability of the economy.

The Subcommittee believes that employment opportunities for youth must not be encouraged where this results in unreasonably low wages or depressed wage standards. Because of the many different views and considerations underlying minimum wage laws, the subcommittee does not recommend any changes in minimum wage legislation for the purpose of stimulating youth employment. In one area it does recommend some exploration. It recommends that the Secretary of Labor examine and review special school work programs* and determine whether his existing authority to set special minimum wage rates can accommodate the development of such programs.

---

* The full Committee at its meeting on June 7, 1962 extended the recommendation to all special school-work programs, rejecting the Subcommittee's proposal that the recommendation apply only to special school-work programs for potential dropouts and for dropouts.

Lack of Understanding of Child-Labor Laws

The inability of many young people to find employment is very often attributed to the child-labor laws. There is a shocking lack of information and understanding of child-labor law provisions on the part of employers, schools, youth, and the public generally. This lack of information has operated to deny youth jobs that are legally permitted.

A number of surveys of youth employment and observations of employment practices have revealed that employers, as well as school and other officials, have mistaken ideas of existing age requirements of the laws relating to the employment of minors. Sometimes employers give the child-labor laws as the reasons for not employing a worker under 18. Often, it was found that there was no legal reason why the person could not have been hired for the job in question. Sometimes, although the law was blamed as the reason, this was not the real reason. The real reason was the employer's resistance to hiring a young worker. Some employers prefer to hire an 18-year-old minor, or prefer a high school graduate. Information is lacking also on the reasons or purposes of the requirements in the law.

The Subcommittee recognizes that since child-labor legislation prohibits employment below certain ages in specified employments or occupations, it is difficult to show all the types of jobs in which minors may work at certain ages, as at 14, at 16, at 18. Recognizing the need for this, a number of State administrators, however, have tried to show positively the jobs which the young worker may enter. In addition to listing the occupations prohibited to minors below specified ages, they have listed in addition, jobs that minors under certain ages might do.

The lack of information on child-labor laws is a direct challenge to labor law administrators. If the young worker is not to be denied job opportunities that are legally open to him greater understanding of the laws on the part of employers, parents, schools, civic groups, the public generally, and minors themselves is essential. Such understanding is necessary also in order to protect the child who is too young to work.

1. We recommend, therefore, that effective continuing informational programs should be developed on the provisions of child-labor laws, their purposes, interpretation, and administration:

a. Informational programs should be directed to employers, personnel officials, school officials, teachers, counselors labor groups, parent-teachers and other civic groups.

b. Administrators should, if possible, make available information on types of jobs which minors of certain ages may do as well as jobs that they may not do.

c. Study and discussion by high-school students and counselors of the child-labor laws and their administration should be encouraged, so they may understand the purposes of such laws and the relation of the laws to work opportunities.

2. To overcome the reluctance of some employers to employ youth because of some misconceptions about child-labor regulations, we recommend also that the Secretary of Labor and the International Association of Governmental Labor Officials develop such active programs of information, including the following:

a. The Bureau of Labor Standards, in its advisory services to State labor departments, consult with State administrators as to the methods they have found useful in disseminating correct information on the child-labor law to employers and the public, and pass such ideas on to other administrators.

b. The Bureau should also provide consultation to administrators in developing such information and programs.

Youth Employment and Service in the Armed Forces

At the present time, the average age of young men inducted involuntarily under Selective Service is about 23. Uncertainties in the draft status of younger out-of-school men are said to operate as an obstacle to their employment. When other men are available, many employers prefer those who have their military service back of them. The registrants are often not given their pre-induction examination until they are well into their 20's. As a result, educational and physical deficiencies may go undetected until the time of such examination. Even when the examination reveals educational deficiencies, no plans presently exist to take such action as would remedy this condition, as is planned in the field of physical disabilities.

The provisions and application of the Universal Military Training and Service Act are of paramount importance in any consideration of the youth employment problem. This law's basic importance is obvious because it applies to all the youth of the nation between the ages of 18 and 26 years. It is from this group that the Selective Service System obtains manpower for the Armed Forces.

Inductees Come From Top of Age Group

The way in which the law is applied is fully as important as the actual wording of the law. The draft does not equally affect all young men in the designated age group because under the regulations used to implement the law those inducted into the Armed Forces are taken from the top of the age group.

Deferments for Students

The law and regulations provide for certain deferments. One such provision permits deferment of high-school students doing satisfactory work until they graduate from high school or arrive at the age of 20, whichever takes place first.

A further provision upon request defers college students doing satisfactory work until the end of the academic year in which they are called. Indeed, deferment until college students complete their entire college course, whether at the undergraduate or graduate level, seems to have been given sympathetic consideration by most local draft boards and greatly urged by educators and the

whole scientific community. Other grounds for deferment exist, but the ones mentioned appear to be of major importance in connection with the youth employment problem.

Induction From the Top of Age Group Compounds Unemployment

The Selective Service policy having greatest impact on youth employment is that which calls for filling quotas from the top of the draft-liable age group. This policy of selecting young men from the top of the age group gives the young man time to complete his high school, college, or apprentice training, but at the same time it creates other problems. Young men at the bottom of the draft-liable age group who are not in school are left in a state of uncertainty during these critical years. This very uncertainty may discourage them from an earnest search for employment. An alarmingly high number of those in the lower age levels of this group are unemployed.

Employers May Hold Back From Hiring Draft-Age Youth

Employers may be reluctant to employ one of these young men because training an employee is usually an expensive proposition. The employer wants to be reasonably sure of the continuing service of the employee before involving himself in this expense.

It should be observed further that the re-employment rights of veterans may make employers reluctant to hire men who have military obligations ahead. These re-employment rights are a commendable feature of the law. Realistically, however, in these days of difficult competition, employers ponder carefully whether they can afford to train a man and incur re-employment liability after only a short period of service by him prior to his being drafted in the armed services.

These facts compound the problem of unemployment among the men in the lower ages of the draft-liable group. It would appear to be much more sensible to have such men fulfill their current military obligation without delay.

Some of the Existing Uncertainties Could Be Resolved

Some of the uncertainty over their draft status could be resolved by the young men themselves. Since they are ultimately subject to induction, it would appear to be sound policy to encourage youth who reach 18 and who have completed their schooling to fulfill their current obligation for military service. Moreover, as the military services have excellent training programs, they

could obtain vocational skills while doing their military service. This training would be valuable to them in obtaining employment when they have finished their service.

Registrants should be informed on the alternative ways by which they may discharge their military obligation, and also on vocational skills that might be acquired while in the services.

The Committee also recognizes that uncertainties with respect to draft status could be resolved for some youth by giving them their pre-induction examination shortly after their registration, as recommended by Subcommittee 3.

Community Action to Rehabilitate Young Men With Educational Deficiencies

A pilot project has been established in New York City by the Public Health Service, the Selective Service System, and the Department of the Army in which men who are rejected because of physical and psychiatric disabilities are given consultation and, if necessary, referred to the community health resources. This suggests the importance of similar procedures to salvage men who have educational deficiencies that will limit them both as employees and as citizens.

From October 1948 to February 1962, some 3½ million registrants were classified 4-F. They were rejected for physical, educational, or moral deficiencies.

Of registrants rejected in pre-induction examinations given between July 1950 and December 1961, 44 percent were not accepted because of educational deficiencies as distinguished from physical or psychiatric rejection. In a study made 4 years ago of 3,594 educational rejectees (including some who did not speak English) from Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, West Virginia, Ohio, and the District of Columbia, 21.6 percent were illiterate with a high mentality. Although a number included in this group were foreign born and had not yet mastered the English language, many were native born, who, in spite of a high mentality, had been unable because of circumstances to acquire a sufficient education to pass the armed forces qualification test.

The Selective Service rejection rate shows up the shortcomings in the education of these young men. They are not only unable to fulfill their current military obligation, but they are severely handicapped jobwise and in carrying out their civic and

other adult responsibilities. The screening process which is costing the government some 6½ million dollars a year is fulfilling no other purpose than its current military use. Use of the information obtained by Selective Service could be extended. Constructive use could be made of it to improve youth and get them in better shape for employment. Positive procedures should be developed by Federal and State officials under which educational rejectees would be referred to State or local school officials for help in correcting their educational deficiencies.

We recognize the value of the recommendation of Subcommittee No. 3 that the Army set up a demonstration project for the lower-functioning young man whom they are now rejecting. The experience which the Army gains should be publicized and made available for widespread use. However, from a long-range point of view, our goal should be to effect better basic education and training in local communities.

1. As current practices under the Selective Service Act affect employment opportunities, the Selective Service System in cooperation with other appropriate agencies or groups should:

   a. examine the selection procedures, including induction from the top of the age group, to see whether, consistent with the Nation's security and overall purposes of the Act, there can be improvement in such procedures to remove employment obstacles.

   b. explore possible ways for referring youth rejected because of educational deficiencies to State or local educational authorities for remedial training. A pilot program worked out by Federal and State officials with some interested local community might point the way by which remedial training could be given in other localities.

2. Every young man, upon registration, should be given a booklet showing alternative methods of fulfilling his current military obligation as well as showing the vocational and educational opportunities that the military services may offer.

3. As an additional means of improving the employability of youth, the forward-looking program for the physical rehabilitation of rejectees being carried on by the Public Health Service in conjunction with the Selective Service System and the Department of the Army should be extended to other areas.

This chart shows the induction age in various countries. This age in countries other than the U. S. A. ranges from 17 to 20. The chart also shows the method under which men are taken into the Selective Service.

1 COUNTRY	2 Population millions	3 Rough Labour Force millions	4 Available Armed Forces	5 Army	6 Army Conscript term months	7 Induction age	8 Notes	9 System C - conscript CM- citizen militia V - voluntary Mx- mixed
I - NATO								
BELGIUM	9.10	3.84	111,000	86,500	12	17		Mx
CANADA	17.63	6.45	120,000	47,500	nil			V
DENMARK	4.54	2.20	43,000	29,000	14	19		C
FRANCE	45.35	19.42	973,000	750,000	28	19		C
GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC	53.04	26.62	240,000	160,000	12	19	Forces increasing	Mx
GREECE	8.65	4.77	160,000	120,000	24			C
ICELAND	0.17	0.9	trace	nil	nil			-
ITALY	49.23	21.42	345,000	260,000	18			C
LUXEMBURG	0.32	0.16	1,800	1,800	12			C
NETHERLANDS	11.41	4.33	130,000	90,000	22		Shorter conscript term being considered	C
NORWAY	3.57	1.55	35,000	18,000	16			C
PORTUGAL	9.08	3.38	72,000	55,000	18			C
TURKEY	26.64	13.11	470,000	400,000	25	19		C
UNITED KINGDOM	52.16	24.18	527,200	259,000	(24)	18	No further conscripts at present being called up	Mx
UNITED STATES	179.80	73.6	2,495,000	870,000	24	19-26		Mx

1 COUNTRY	2 Population millions	3 Rough Labour Force millions	4 Available Armed Forces	5 Army	6 Army Conscript term months	7 Induction age	8 Notes	9 System C - conscript CM- citizen militia V - voluntary Mx- mixed
II- SOME OTHERS								
AUSTRALIA	10.2	4.11	48,000	22,000	(3)	19	Three months' compulsory service just abolished: i.e. citizen reserve available	V
ISRAEL	2.1	1.3	300,000	264,000	30	18	Forces at 12 hours' notice; include women; pay supplemented by employers.	CM
SWEDEN	7.47	3.8	650,000	600,000	14	20	Most forces at 72 hours' notice	CM
SWITZERLAND	5.26	2.75	400,000	350,000	12	20	Forces at 36 hours' notice; pay supplemented by employers	CM
USSR								
a. Jan. '60	208.83	105	3,900,000	2,500,000	24	19*	Col. 4 incl. 250,000 armed police	C
b. Forthcoming	216		2,725,000	1,160,000	24			C

* Start training at age 10

Source: MEN IN UNIFORM, Military Manpower in Modern Industrial Societies by M. R. D. Foot, published for The Institute for Strategic Studies, London, England

Minimum Age Provisions

The minimum age set for employment is the most important and basic provision in child-labor laws. The State child-labor laws and the child-labor provisions of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act set a basic minimum age for employment. Under the Federal act and under about half the child-labor laws, this age is higher for employment in factories and for employment during school hours (usually 16) than for work outside school hours in non-factory work.

The Subcommittee has considered whether these basic minimum age standards adversely affect employment opportunities (1) for minors 16 and 17 years of age, and (2) for children 14 and 15. It has reviewed these standards against the changing occupational and industrial structure of the country, population developments with the increasing number of young people in the work force, and the higher educational and vocational requirements that youth will need to meet their responsibility.

State Standards

In 19 States a basic minimum age of 16 is set for employment in factories or manufacturing establishments at any time. In about 24 States, a basic minimum age of 16 applies for work during school hours -- 9 of these apply to any gainful occupation, 11 to any gainful occupation except agriculture and domestic service, and 4 to specified establishments such as factories, mechanical establishments, mercantile stores, dry cleaning establishments, hotels, etc. In the remaining States, employment during school hours is permitted at 14 (15 in two States).

Outside school hours, the basic minimum age is usually 14, except in factory employment in the States with a higher minimum fixed for factory work.

Federal Provisions

Under the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act, minors 16 years of age or over may be employed in any occupation except one that has been declared hazardous by the Secretary of Labor. The minimum age for such occupations is 18 years.

Under regulations of the Secretary of Labor minors 14 and 15 years of age may be employed outside school hours for a limited number of hours in specified occupations not involving manufacturing or processing or employment in workrooms where such activities take place, or in the operation or tending of power-driven machinery. A special regulation applying to retail, food service, and gasoline establishments became effective June 1, 1962. This regulation permits minors 14 and 15 years of age to be employed in office work and in specified sales, cleanup, and service occupations in such establishments even though processing may be involved, and to operate specified nonhazardous power-driven machines.

Application to 16 and over

Neither the Federal child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act nor the State minimum age provisions of 16 for employment in factories during school hours operate as a roadblock to minors 16 and over.

The Subcommittee is aware that the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act sets a higher minimum age for girls than for boys. A minimum age of 18 applies for girls, 16 for boys. The Committee does not believe that this act has an appreciable effect on the employment of youth. It notes, however, that under the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act the same minimum age applies for both boys and girls. It is, therefore, calling the minimum age difference in the Public Contracts Act to the attention of the Secretary of Labor, with the suggestion that he explore the effect of the difference as it relates to employment opportunity for girls.

Application to 14 and 15

State laws. In practically all the 19 States the language appears to cover all employment "in" factories, sometimes work "in connection with" or "about" factories and in a few instance "in or in connection with any manufacturing, mechanical, or processing occupation." This language, literally interpreted, would appear to prohibit any employment of minors 14 and 15 (unless specifically exempted) in factory offices, in lunch rooms in stores, in certain nonpublic messenger work, or work in any rooms where any processing or manufacturing is carried on including small shops or stores where only incidental processing is done. The application of the 16 year minimum age to places in which any processing or manufacturing is done appears to rule out work in 5 and 10 stores and other stores if in those stores processing or manufacturing is carried on even incidentally.

Two of the States expressly exempt office work. One of these exempts work other than in the workroom where processing is done. A third State exempts office work provided the office is enclosed and separate from the manufacturing operation or process. This State also exempts service stores where cleaning and pressing is carried on provided it does not involve the use of dangerous machinery and equipment or chemical processes.

The Subcommittee is aware that the particular wording of minimum age provisions in State child-labor laws has grown out of experience. The wording has usually been inserted in the laws to take care of some particular type of situation that was harmful to children. The Subcommittee is reluctant to categorize the wording of minimum age provisions as being too extreme, since it does not have a clear understanding of all the situations to which they may be applied. It would seem that some of the jobs to which these provisions are said to be applied are such that children 14 or 15 might work safely in them. It further believes that a few job opportunities might be opened to children 14 or 15 outside school hours for work in factory offices, in retail stores or small shops where some incidental processing may be performed, and which now appear to be prohibited under some of the State child-labor laws.

The new Federal Regulation 3 opens up a number of jobs in retail, food service, and gasoline establishments for minors 14 and 15 to be employed outside school hours in office work and certain sales, cleanup and service occupations in such establishments even though processing may be involved. They may operate, also, certain nonhazardous power-driven machines.

The Subcommittee recognizes that children under 16 years of age have no place as full-time workers in our economy. Their place is in school. Such work as they are permitted to do should be incidental to schooling. It should be sufficiently limited as not to interfere with their education. It should be properly supervised and not hazardous. Work of these children outside school hours should merely provide them with some work experience. If jobs are scarce, the employer will naturally prefer the older student of 16 or 17 (for whom work experience can be much more meaningful.)

To help provide some additional employment opportunities for children 14 and 15 outside school hours, State labor law administrators in States that set 16 for all work in factories or in processing or mechancial establishments should review the application of these 16-year minimum age provisions to see if some work in these establishments might be permitted for 14- and 15-year-olds outside school hours without jeopardizing the protection

needed for these young children. The Subcommittee has in mind employment opportunities such as work in offices, and non-hazardous work in certain shops and stores where the manufacturing or processing carried on is incidental.

It is suggested that this recommendation be submitted to the International Association of Governmental Labor Officials for its consideration.

Effect of Nightwork Prohibitions on Employment Opportunities of Youth

With the development of suburban shopping centers, changes have occurred in the hours during which stores are open and customers shop in such areas. Retail stores are open until 9 or 10 p.m.--some even later; a few all night. Mothers or fathers of small children often shop during evening hours. It has been suggested the employment opportunities of students in the suburbs are unnecessarily hindered by existing nightwork prohibitions and that work at night should be permitted at least on certain days.

The Federal Fair Labor Standards Act contains no restrictions on the nightwork of youth 16 and over. For Children of 14 and 15, nightwork is prohibited from 7 p.m. to 7 a.m.

A review of existing nightwork prohibitions shows that employment opportunities for the 16- or 17-year old boy are little affected by existing nightwork prohibitions.

Every State law except one permits a boy 16 or over to work until 10 p.m. or later. In this one State, he can work until 9 p.m. In 31 States he can work all night.

The laws in 26 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico reflect public opinion against work of girls late at night. Nightwork prohibitions for girls 16 and 17 begin as early as 6 p.m., but usually girls may work until 9 or 10. Nightwork of girls is not restricted in 24 States.

For children 14 and 15, the laws generally do not permit nightwork after 6 or 7 p.m. (33 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico). Fourteen States prohibit work after 8, 9, or 10 p.m. and three have no nightwork prohibition. Twelve of the States that prohibit work after 6, 7, or 8 p.m. permit work until 9 or 10 p.m., or later, under certain conditions -- often on nights preceding non-school days.

Nightwork has been prohibited by child-labor legislation for children under 16 and also for minors 16 and 17 for their own protection. It was felt that nightwork might affect the youth's school progress. It may weaken seriously the close tie with his family. It may require undesirable readjustment in his social pattern. The youth may seek recreation after he finishes his job and drift into unwholesome situations. Existing legislation re-

flects the protection which the various States feel is essential for their youth.

The Subcommittee concluded that so few restrictions affect nightwork of minors 16 and over that they can have little effect in barring employment opportunities for this age group. Boys 16 and over may work until 10 p.m. or later in all but one State; girls may work until 9 or 10 p.m. or later in most States. In fact, in about half the States there is need for nightwork protection for these minors.

The Subcommittee believes that nightwork restrictions for children under 16 years of age are necessary for their protection. It also believes that job opportunities should not be created for children under 16 at the expense of older youth and adults. It points to the number of unemployed youth 16 years and over, both out of school and in school who are available for jobs.

We do not at present have adequate research and factual information regarding the effect of State and Federal nightwork restrictions on youth employment opportunities for minors 14 and 15, particularly in retail shopping centers during evening hours. We therefore recommend that research be initiated in this field and that nightwork standards not be relaxed for youth 14 and 15 unless the facts reveal that such relaxations would substantially increase employment opportunities without at the same time lessening needed standards for the protection of the health, welfare, and schooling of this age group.

Limitation on Hours of Work of In-School Youth Employed Outside School Hours

The Subcommittee has reviewed the State and Federal regulations that place maximum daily or weekly hours on the work of in-school children to see whether these provisions are an unnecessary barrier to the employment of in-school youth who wish to work outside school hours.

Under the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act minors 14 and 15 years of age are prohibited from working more than 3 hours a day or 18 hours a week. No similar prohibition applies to persons 16 or over.

In over half the States there are no regulations controlling daily hours of part-time employment of youth attending school. Hours regulations on such employment do exist in 20 States and Puerto Rico. The provisions in the 20 States and Puerto Rico apply more frequently to the employment of in-school youth under 16 than to those 16 or 17. The laws of only six States (California, Kentucky, Maryland, Michigan, Pennsylvania, Utah) and Puerto Rico apply to minors under 18, while the New York law applies to those under 17.

Most of the provisions exempt certain work varying from State to State. The exemptions apply to such work as agriculture, domestic service in private homes, peach packing, sale or delivery of newspapers, or as baby sitters.

The laws restricting hours of employment of in-school youth either limit the maximum number of daily work hours on school days or during school weeks or both, or they provide in effect that the hours of work outside school hours when combined with the time spent in school shall not exceed a specified daily maximum or occasionally a weekly maximum. A few combine both approaches.

Those using the first approach usually set a limit of 3 or 4 hours a day and 18 to 28 hours a week. Those using the second approach usually limit the combined hours of school and work to 8 or 9 hours a day. As the school day may not be the same throughout a State, a limitation on combined hours of school and work may have different effects in different places within a State. According to a National Education Association report, the median schoolday is about 6 hours.

In October 1961, according to Bureau of Labor Statistics figures, two-and-a-half million youth 14-17 were employed. These youth constituted a fifth of all the children in this age group.

Continuing a trend that started during World War II, close to three-quarters of these children, or 2 million, were in-school youth working outside school hours. Most youth attend school 6 hours a day and usually have homework and school activities that take up other hours in the day. They do not have many hours available for employment. Neither the Federal child-labor law nor any State sets a weekly limitation of less than 18 hours a week in nonagricultural employment. Yet close to three-quarters of the school-enrolled children in nonagricultural employment worked less than 15 hours a week. Ninety percent worked less than 22 hours a week, ten percent worked 22 hours or more, including two percent who worked 40 hours or more.

As school is the primary job for boys and girls attending school, their employment outside school hours should not interfere with their school progress. The more than 2 million in-school youth who have found jobs, contrasted with approximately 200,000 who were looking for work and were unable to find it, plus the fact that the Bureau of Labor Statistics figures show that the great majority (over 90 percent) of the in-school group with jobs work less than the maximum hours set, indicate that these laws constitute no barrier to their employment.

Moreover, only 20 States and Puerto Rico limit the hours of employment of in-school youth, which leaves 30 States in which youth under 18 could legally work <u>at least</u> 8 hours a day and 40 hours a week outside of school hours. The fact that only 10 percent of such youth have been reported as working 22 or more hours further confirms the conclusion that provisions in the States limiting out-of-school hours do not act as roadblocks to jobs.

<u>The Committee recommends no change in this legislation. It believes that these laws are a necessary protection to in-school youth, particularly in periods of high employment when high wages or other factors might induce students to work for longer hours than is consistent with their school progress</u>.

School Attendance Laws

The school attendance laws of the several States and Puerto Rico provide seemingly for a uniform school-leaving age, 16 years. Yet an examination of these laws reveals a number of exemptions which permit children under 16 to leave school. Granted that the number of children exempted from school attendance eacy year is a relatively small one, and granted that in some States these exemptions are limited drastically, the fact remains that it is possible for children 14 and 15 to be excused from further school attendance, and that it does happen. The 1960 census figures show that there are a number of persons who lack even rudimentary education. Whatever the reasons, a lack of enforcement of school attendance laws, exclusion from school at an early age, or the lack of educational facilities for the child with special problems, the educational goals we profess to hold are not being met, and as a result the employability of youth is affected.

Forty-six States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have compulsory school attendance laws. The upper age for required attendance is 16 years in 37 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; 17 years in 5 States; and 18 years in 4 States. Only 6 States require attendance to 16 years without exemptions. In the remaining States, certain unusual exemptions allow the child to leave school usually at 14 or 15 years of age. Generally these exemptions are for (1) employment, (2) employment and completion of a certain grade, (3) completion of elementary school or a certain grade, (4) inability to profit from further attendance, (5) need. Some individual States also allow children to be released "if for his best interests," "for good cause," "for maladjustment to the school program."

Four States have repealed their compulsory school attendance laws, with one of these subsequently passing a school attendance law whereby separate school districts may elect to adopt the school law and are given the power to suspend its operation.

An analysis of the reasons for which children may be excused from school before the age of 16 brings up certain questions. It should be understood that we are not considering the child who is so handicapped physically or mentally, or both, that he is unable to participate in the school program in a regular school setting. We are aware that special classes or schools are provided for these children, and we firmly believe that if they are not provided, they should be.

Our main concern is with the child in the normal school setting who may be excused from school on grounds of necessity, or for employment, or because he will no longer profit from attendance. The question immediately arises about the capability of the children so excused. Are they unable to absorb the education offered them? Are we losing capable children because of lack of "adjustment" to the school program?

Subcommittee 5 was charged with examining laws affecting youth employment. It has been necessary for us to examine practices under the laws as well, to determine whether in the administration of the laws, employment of youth is affected. School attendance laws are a positive force in helping to prepare youth for employment. Lack of enforcement and exemptions do not seem to be in the best interest of the child or in the best interest of a nation whose economy is dependent on literacy, technical know-how, and the adaptability of its labor force.

Without additional studies of the characteristics of the children excused from school, their mental capacity, degree of motivation and emotional stability, and without an analysis of the reasons why some children are excused from further school attendance, it is difficult to determine the causes and relate them to corrective measures. It is correspondingly difficult to determine whether the educational program in the schools they attended is adequate.

Without going too deeply into the merits of our educational system we are aware that city schools and schools in rural areas have particular problems that may have a bearing on keeping children in school and stimulating them to continue their education. In the cities differences in cultural background are being recognized more and more as a significant block to the learning process. Some very successful experiments and pilot projects have been conducted on this subject in order to develop a school curriculum which has meaning to the children coming from a different culture, and to assist the teacher coming from a middle-class background to use methods which will help bridge the cultural gap.

In rural areas, schools are hard pressed to provide the variety and scope of program which are needed. In both city schools and rural schools, the matter of adequate community support for a comprehensive educational program will be a continuing problem.

Incident to compulsory school attendance for children up to 16 is the matter of continuing education, its appeal, its availability, and its cost. Adult education programs have been a contributing factor in assisting persons who for one reason or another have not continued or completed the education they want. Adult education is by no means limited to or synonymous with the system of vocational

education administered by the U. S. Office of Education and the various States. Adult education is much broader.

Once the child has fulfilled his compulsory school requirements and left school, what opportunities are open to him to resume schooling, complete his high school education, or take additional post-high school work? What means exist to bring adult education programs and related services like home demonstration programs to the people most in need of them, migratory workers, public housing tenants, and the like? Education for persons out of school must not be limited to traditional vocational courses, valuable as they are, nor should adult education be limited to persons who are able to pay for it.

School attendance laws are evidence of the premium we as Americans place on education, education for all. Such a goal places great stress on a system that must be varied enough to educate youth of widely different abilities and capacities. The Subcommittee believes that emphasis should be placed not on relaxing attendance requirements, but on strengthening the educational system.

It is generally accepted that children should attend school until 16 years of age, but in over half the States, children of 14 or 15 can leave school for a variety of reasons, and can go to work. Actually most children of these ages are enrolled in school. In 1961, 98 percent of the population of 14- and 15-year olds and 84 percent of the 16-and 17-year olds are reported enrolled in school. This still means however that, in one year, 160,000 children 14 and 15 years of age were not in school and not in institutions. Of this number, 52,000 were in the labor force.

The only major group of children under 16 who may not have the benefit of required school attendance are the children of migrant agricultural workers, who are discussed in a separate paper.

Recognizing that administration of schools is a local and State responsibility, the Subcommittee directs its recommendations to local school district officials, school boards, and all public school administrators as well as to the U. S. Office of Education for the leadership they can provide in promoting community acceptance and support of better educational opportunities.

1. <u>In the best interests of the child, every effort should be made to maintain children in school until at least 16 years of age</u>.

2. Curriculum and educational opportunities should be adapted to the needs of children to stimulate their interest in achievement and their desire to continue in school.

3. School-attendance laws should be rigorously enforced.

4. Exemptions from school attendance should be given only as a last resort.

5. Full-time employment opportunities for children under 16 should not be promoted.

6. School attendance laws should be applied uniformly to all children within a school district so as to include children of migratory workers.

7. Educational needs do not stop at a particular age. To improve employment opportunities for out-of-school youth, States and communities are urged to develop additional public education programs to meet gaps in educational preparation.

Children of Migratory Agricultural Workers

Probably no group of children in the U. S. today is more disadvantaged than the children of domestic migratory agricultural workers. There are between 185,000 and 225,000 of these children. They accompany their parents as they migrate from one State to another seeking work in planting and harvesting our crops. Many of these children work along in the fields with their fathers and mothers; others, too young to work, are left in the camp during work hours with scant attention.

Because these migrant families are not residents of the State or locality in which they are temporarily working they do not have the same opportunities that are available to resident families. The mobility of these families, their isolation from normal communities, indeed their way of life presents unique problems that demand special regulations and procedures.

The very lack of special legislation and lack of provisions for special services for migrant agricultural workers and their families operates as a barrier to their future employment opportunities and to their education, training, and development into mature and responsible adults.

The children of migrant agricultural families live in one migrant camp after another, generally under undesirable and crowded conditions. They grow up in an abnormal family and community life. As the President's Committee on Migratory Labor has pointed out:

> "They live under a common condition but create no techniques for meeting common problems. The public acknowledges the existence of migrants yet declines to accept them as full members of the community. As crops ripen, farmers await their coming; as the harvest closes, the community with equal anxiety awaits their going."

Recognizing that these children cannot be considered separately from their parents, any efforts to provide sanitary facilities, decent housing, safe transportation, and protection from exploitation by unscrupulous crew leaders would benefit the whole family including the children. The well-being of children would likewise be improved if the parents were given the same protection afforded industrial workers, including being adequately paid for their labor.

The plight of the children of migrant farm families has been the subject of many studies. Private groups, governmental agencies, and committees such as Federal, State, and local migrant committees, have worked diligently to improve the conditions of the migrant.

A number of States, communities, and volunteer groups have taken action especially directed to improving the welfare of the migrant. Twenty-eight States have laws or regulations applying to the site and the operation of farm labor camps. Eight States set safety standards for vehicles used in the transportation of farm workers; in addition, a Federal law provides for regulation of interstate transportation of migrants. Nine States and Puerto Rico have laws requiring registration of farm labor contractors or crew leaders. Some States have adapted their maternal and child health services to the needs of migrants, some have used funds for health and welfare services, a few areas have established day-care centers. Volunteer groups provide day-care centers, social workers and other related services on a limited basis. Often in those areas where child welfare and other services are legally available to migrants, they do not have the knowledge or facilities to avail themselves of them.

Migrants are largely excluded from assistance programs available to workers who suffer sickness or other misfortune. Residence requirements often bar help other than emergency help from county welfare departments. Although certain farm workers qualify for OASDI, depending on amounts earned or days worked for a single employer, no information is available as to the number of migrants who are building up accounts.

Generally agricultural workers do not have the protection afforded industrial workers. For instance, State minimum wage laws usually do not apply to farm work.* The Fair Labor Standards Act exempts agriculture completely from the wage and hour provisions. In the field of workmen's compensation, 8 States and Puerto Rico cover agricultural workers in the same manner as other workers, though an additional 9 States cover some farm workers. They are generally outside the unemployment insurance laws, industrial relations, and wage payment laws.

Fair Labor Standards Act sets a 16-year minimum age for employment in agriculture during the hours that the school in the district is in session. No age is set for employment outside school hours. Less than a third of the State child-labor laws

---

* The Hawaii and Puerto Rico laws apply to agricultural workers, and in 2 other States minimum wage orders apply to women and minors in agriculture.

set a minimum age for employment during school hours. Only 9 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia set a minimum for employment outside school hours, ranging from 10 to 14.

Compulsory school-attendance laws, with a few exceptions, do not apply to migrant children because they are not residents in the State in which their parents are temporarily working. In addition, at least 7 States are operating summer schools or special school services for migrants. A few States have authorized local school districts to add in their general budgets the costs of running schools for migrants. A number give financial assistance to local communities which are providing schooling for migrants on the basis of average daily attendance.

Notwithstanding these and other efforts of communities and volunteer groups on behalf of migrants, opportunities for migrants to attend school are very meager. The school achievement of the migrant agricultural worker is usually below the fourth grade level--the lowest educational attainment of any group in the country. Thus the poverty and illiteracy of the adult migrant agricultural worker is being perpetuated in his children.

There are tens of thousands of migrant children, it is estimated, who are not receiving education equal to that provided other children in our country. Few migrant children attend school regularly.* Information from several States indicate that more than half of the children are reported to be retarded educationally from one to four years.

The education these children acquire is literally on the run--a month here, a few weeks there. They enter school late and leave early. Their attendance is irregular or for short periods. Typically, they have made little progress in school. Many are embarrassed because they are below their age group, and drop out early.

Their lack of a basic minimum of education sufficient for them to participate effectively in our society, and their lack of occupational skills, will make them a liability to our economy. As adults, they will be without the education and training to compete for the skilled jobs, perhaps unable to find a job at all. Society eventually will pay the price, since these uneducated children when they become adults may have to be supported by the taxpayers.

---

* U. S. Office of Education, "The Education of Migrant Children," O.E. 20038, 1962, p.6.

Children of migrant workers are growing up without the protections and the opportunities available to resident children. With the decreasing number of agricultural jobs available and the increasing upgrading of skills necessary for non-agricultural jobs, children who have missed out on their education and training may face a lifetime filled largely by unemployment or unrewarding employment. Because of conditions under which migrants work and live, special legislation and special procedures and techniques must be developed and applied to them if they are to have the opportunities for education and normal development provided other children.

1. Migrant children should be afforded protection and benefits equivalent to those afforded resident children and legislation should be enacted where necessary and procedures and techniques developed to bring these benefits and services to children of migrant workers. Benefits should include:

   a. health and welfare services (this would include, among other things, removal of residence requirements and provision for reimbursement to hospitals, for care, from public funds where needed);

   b. provision for schooling adapted to the migrants' needs: recognizing the impact of migrant children on school facilities in certain areas, provision for financial aid, both State and Federal, should be provided these communities;

   c. a pilot program to educate adult migrants, since improvement in their education will help stabilize the development of their children.

2. State child-labor standards for employment should be extended to children in agriculture both during and outside school hours, including:

   a. For work during school hours, the 16-year minimum age provided under Federal law should be reinforced by State legislation setting a 16-year minimum.

   b. For work outside school hours, the 14-year minimum applicable to employment in nonagricultural work under Federal law and most State laws should be extended to agriculture.

Effect of Public Law 78 on Employment Opportunities of Youth

Foreign farm laborers have been imported into the United States since the beginning of World War II. The United States and Mexico first entered into an agreement for the recruitment of Mexican nationals in 1942. During World War II when 15 million men were in the armed forces, in no year were more than 62,170 Mexican laborers brought in. Since 1951, their importation has been governed by Public Law 78, originally passed for a 2-year period and subsequently extended. In that year the number of Mexican nationals brought in was 192,000. In 1956 the number reached 445,197.* Almost 300,000 Mexicans were brought into the country during the fiscal year 1961.

Public Law 78 provides for an agreement between the United States and the Republic of Mexico, under which Mexican agricultural workers (braceros) are recruited and transported into the United States by the U. S. Department of Labor for employment on farms. The act specifically provided that no workers recruited under this title shall be available for employment unless the Secretary has determined and certified that (1) sufficient domestic workers who are able, willing, and qualified are not available at the time and place needed to perform the work for which such workers are to be employed; (2) the employment of such workers will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers similarly employed; (3) reasonable efforts have been made to attract domestic workers for such employment at wages and standard hours of work and working conditions comparable to those offered to foreign workers.

The importation of these Mexican workers has had the unintended effect in some areas of enabling employers to use Mexican agricultural workers when domestic farm workers are in fact available. Employers generally appear to prefer Mexican farm workers to domestic farm workers. Impartial groups, who have studied the problem have all concluded that the large number of Mexican farm workers brought in adversely affect the wages, working conditions, and employment opportunities of domestic farm workers. As a result of the program many thousands of domestic agricultural workers annually migrate from their homes in the border States to other States, seeking work where competition from foreign nationals does not tend to depress their wages and working conditions.

---

* See "Foreign workers admitted for Temporary Employment in U. S. Agriculture 1942-1960;" and Supplement for 1961.

With the most recent extension of Public Law 78, in 1961, stronger safeguards for domestic workers were provided. By virtue of these safeguards foreign workers must not be recruited:

a. for employment in other than temporary or seasonal occupations, except in specific cases when found by the Secretary of Labor necessary to avoid undue hardship; or

b. for employment to operate or maintain power-driven self-propelled harvesting, planting, or cultivating machinery, except in specific cases when found by the Secretary of Labor necessary for a temporary period to avoid undue hardship.

Although the 1961 Act contains no additional language requiring that the importation shall not adversely affect the wages and employment of domestic workers, the legislative history of the Act indicated that it was the intent of Congress that the Secretary of Labor should administer the continuation of this program in such a way as to eliminate the adverse effect already noted and to prescribe standards and make determinations essential for the protection of the wages and working conditions of domestic agricultural workers.

The Secretary of Labor, in carrying out this intent, took steps to insure that the employment of foreign workers would not adversely affect wages of domestic workers. The Secretary in 1962 established higher wage rates which farmers must pay in order to obtain foreign workers. Under revised policies of the Department, farmers who desire to employ Mexican workers must offer domestic workers no less than the wage rate offered foreign labor. Moreover, the National enforcement staff has been sharply expanded.

The wage rates for employment of Mexican workers differ by State. In 16 out of 22 States employing Mexican workers, the rate is $1.00 an hour. The six States with rates below $1.00 are: Arizona, 95¢; Arkansas, 60¢; Colorado, 90¢; Kentucky, 80¢; New Mexico, 75¢; Texas, 70¢.

Studies conducted in the areas using Mexican labor have shown that until action was taken by the Department of Labor wages paid domestic farm workers tended to remain static or in some areas to be reduced. They have tended to lag behind wages paid in areas not using Mexican nationals in the same State.

Even with these benefits domestic workers are still at a disadvantage. Contract guarantees give Mexican workers a number of advantages such as paid transportation, work guarantees, free

housing, minimum wage rates, workmen's compensation insurance, and performance guarantee. On the other hand, practically no labor legislation has been extended to the domestic farm worker and they rarely are protected by collective bargaining in determining their working conditions.

Although the program under Public Law 78 affects employment opportunities of young farm workers, the total adverse impact is far greater. This law affects wages, working conditions, and employment opportunities of all domestic farm workers. The 1961 amendment, however, combined with the recent action that the Department of Labor has taken in carrying out the Congressional intent to protect the domestic worker, should be helpful in improving the opportunities for employment, as well as the wages and welfare of domestic agricultural workers and their families.

The domestic worker, however, is still not given the same stable employment and protection afforded the Mexican workers.

1. <u>Extension of Public Law 78 should be considered only with proposed amendments or with administrative action to eliminate any adverse effect on the domestic migrant worker</u>. We suggest continuation of the hearings which the Secretary of Labor instituted in 1962, to determine wage rates, or utilize other measures to determine whether Public Law 78 adversely affects domestic farm workers.

2. <u>Appropriate steps should be taken to eliminate any adverse effects on domestic agricultural workers</u>.

PROBLEMS OF YOUTH IN LARGE CITY SLUMS

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NUMBER 6

President's Committee on Youth Employment

Members of Subcommittee No. 6

Dr. James B. Conant, Chairman
Mr. Joseph A. Beirne
Mrs. Mary C. Kohler
Mr. James F. Oates, Jr.
Mrs. Mildred M. Jeffrey
Mr. James R. Fleming
Mrs. Geri Joseph
Mr. Whitney M. Young, Jr.

Resource Staff
Mrs. Wickens (Labor-Secy)
Miss Plunkett (Labor-BLS)
Dr. Taeuber (Commerce-Census)

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT IN URBAN SLUMS

1. The concept of an area of concentrated unemployment within a large city should be adopted.

   The description of such a distressed area might be approximately as follows: an area within a large city in which 50,000 to 100,000 persons are dwelling and in which the overall unemployment rate is an appropriate multiple of the rate for the entire city. There may be more than one such area in a city, and the areas need not be contiguous.

2. The Secretary of Labor should fix the guidelines and with consultation and cooperation with local authorities arrange for the designation of such areas within representative large cities.

3. School boards in the large cities should be asked to give the President's Committee on Youth Employment information on the dropout rate in each school serving these areas and the list of curricula being offered in the schools in these areas.

4. Subcommittee No. 4, in considering the establishment of training institutes for counselors, should give special consideration to the training of counselors for work in schools in areas of concentrated unemployment.

5. It is hoped that Subcommittee No. 1 might give special consideration to recommending ways of providing incentives for private employers to employ youth residing in the areas of concentrated unemployment.

6. The U. S. Employment Service, in cooperation with the school authorities, should arrange for a periodic report on the number of youth 16-21 in these areas in each of the following categories:

   a. in school or college full-time;

   b. in school part time and employed;

   c. and to the extent feasible of those employed.
   If the Detroit approach is feasible, it should be extended to other areas.

7. In the administration of Sec. 202 of Public Law 87-415 (selection of trainees) and Bill HR 10682 if it becomes law, special consideration should be given to youth residing in the areas of concentrated unemployment as defined in recommendation 1 above.

★ U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1963 O - 694-478